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In recent years, Taiwan’s political development has attracted the attention of western political scientists interested in democratic transitions in authoritarian states. Many theories have been suggested to explain Taiwan’s rapidly political progress. But, these theories, which have mainly focused on socio-economic and cultural factors, are insufficient, and provide only a partial explanation for Taiwan’s democratization. This thesis argues that we must also probe the developmental history of Taiwan’s opposition and its strategies in its struggles with the ruling party -- Kuomintang (KMT.)

Since Taiwan’s main opposition party, the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP), presents as an indigenous party, it will be necessary to stress the importance of ethnicity in Taiwan’s politics. Without the dynamic of ethnicity to elicit sympathy among Taiwanese people, integrate them into a collective power, and help them finally establish an opposition party, Taiwan might well still be an authoritarian state today; an authoritarian state enjoying high economic growth like Singapore, but nevertheless an authoritarian state.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

After transitions towards democracy flourished in South Europe, Latin America, and East Asia, beginning in the mid-1970s, political scientists began to contemplate and compile general preconditions needed for democratization. Previous studies have argued that certain socio-economic and cultural forces such as industrial development, urbanization, a substantial middle class, and influential Western liberal ideologies form the basis for democracy.\(^1\) Although Alan M. Wachman and others have argued that these “preconditions” cited by various theorists are merely “correlative” rather than “causative” factors,\(^2\) it is still essential for one to obtain a socio-economic and cultural profile of a state when researching its democratization.

---

\(^1\) This theory is mainly included in the following publications:


3. Larry Diamond, Juan J. Linz, and Seymour Martin Lipset, Politics in Developing Countries Comparing Experiences With Democracy, Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 1990, pp. 1-34.

\(^2\) Alan M. Wachman, Taiwan: National Identity and Democratization, Armonk, N.Y., M.E. Sharpe, 1994b, p. 36.
Even though these socio-economic and cultural considerations may be only partially determinative to a country’s democracy, it is still hard for one to ignore that these factors may construct the foundation and background of a country’s democratization, and even provide a cohort of potential political leaders.

According to Seymour M. Lipset, the democracy of a state, especially the stability of democracy, “is related to the state of economic development.” He argues that “the more well-to-do a nation, the greater the chances that it will sustain democracy.” 3 In the case of Taiwan, Lipset even stresses that “an important foundation for democracy in .... Taiwan was generated by land reforms and other steps that reduce socioeconomic inequality.” 4 Lucian Pye has suggested that Taiwan demonstrates that economic growth can lead to the rise of political participation, the birth of differing and competing values and ideals, and, thus, the impetus to bring down authoritarian rule. 5 One of Taiwan’s leading political scientists, Tien Hung-mao, agrees and furthers that industrial growth has created the tools to promote democratization. 6 According to Tien’s interpretation, the democratizing role of the

---


6 Tien Hung-mao, “The Transformation of an Authoritarian Party-State: Taiwan’s
new middle class is pivotal. Economic growth stimulates the rise of the middle class, and “in general, it is the middle class who support political reform and democratization.” Tien also argues that “many of the middle class have supported opposition movements, either as an expression of their dissatisfaction with the ruling KMT, or their desire for political alternatives.”

But economic development or impulse may not sufficiently ensure regime transformation. The demand for democracy may move a country into “a zone of political transition.” But the direction of political change is not preordained. Tun-jen Cheng argues that:

instead of fostering democracy, economic performance may well make an authoritarian regime more resilient, if not more legitimate, or it may even give rise to authoritarianism. An authoritarian regime may succeed in co-opting or containing counter-elites. In the calculus of the attentive public, the opportunity cost of democratic movement may be too high to bear. Minimum concessions to popular demand for a greater say in politics may well extend the life of an existing authoritarian regime. In the end, democratic ferment may serve to consolidate authoritarianism.

---


9 Tun-jen Chen, “Democratizing The Quasi-Leninist Regime In Taiwan,” World
Alan M. Wachman also argues that if a high level of economic development is a precondition of democracy, it will appear insufficient to explain why India is far more democratic than the wealthy oil-producing states in the Middle East.10 Among Chinese societies,11 the very evidence of this phenomenon is Singapore. Despite the fact that Singapore has undergone a terrific economic growth within the past few decades, it is still an authoritarian state. Thus, achieving higher economic growth may reinforce an authoritarian regime, compelling some citizens to accept some limitations such as a cartel of political power, and limitations on or repression of political and civil liberties to maintain a good economy.

Although Wachman and Tun-jen Cheng argue that economic development alone may not be "sufficient" for Taiwan to become democratic, they do not deny that the traditional socio-economic factors are important. In reviewing those transitional systems in the mid-1970s, Taiwan especially, transforming from a Leninist regime to a more democratic state, has become the focus of political scientists attentive to Chinese politics and democratization. Most studies of Taiwan’s democratization have focused on these socio-economic or cultural preconditions, and have done quite well. From this point of view, socio-economic development can be regarded as a


11 “Chinese societies” means areas where ethnic Chinese constitute the bulk of the citizenry, such as Mainland China, Taiwan, Singapore, Hong Kong, and, to a lesser
background force which has contributed to Taiwan’s democratization in the following ways: (a) producing new, educated, and professional generations of oppositionists, such as lawyers, doctors, ministers, etc.; and (b) generating the new Taiwanese business and middle class which may have provided funding for the opposition, and also made the opposition difficult for the ruling KMT to ignore or suppress.

However, socio-economic development theory is still insufficient in two aspects when explaining Taiwan’s democratization. First, socio-economic development causes the rise of middle class. But, in contrast to what the theory would predict, much of that middle class in Taiwan, specifically the mainlanders, were not pro-opposition. Rather, they supported the current ruling party. Based on this point, we can conclude that certain factors have been much more determinative and “causative” than socio-economic development in Taiwan’s democratization. Second, many studies stress that permitting the presence or existence of an opposition is crucial to democratic transition. But this theory does not tell us much about how such an opposition party forms and institutionalizes itself in a highly repressive system. So, to precisely probe the determinative elements of Taiwan’s democratization, this study will place the traditional socio-economic and cultural path in the background, and mainly concentrate on political power bases to discover how an opposition party forms in a tightly organized and controlled Leninist authoritarian system,12 and extent, Malaysia.

12 In a Leninist authoritarian state, either public or private association, especially in the ideological aspect, is highly controlled by the coercive apparatus of ruling party.
contributes to the rise of democracy.

Theoretical Backgrounds and Questions

Diamond, Linz, and Lipset have identified three conditions\(^{13}\) that explain the complex process of democratic transition, including (1) the emergence of opposition parties, (2) the rise of political participation, and (3) the protection of civil and political liberty. These conditions, seem to suggest a logical line of causation, specifically that: increased political participation (leads to) \(\longrightarrow\) the rise of opposition parties (which leads to) \(\longrightarrow\) greater protection of human rights. Accordingly, we can see that the factors needed for democracy depend on the emergence of political participation and an opposition party; that is, as long as an opposition party emerges through the process of political participation, civil rights, then, are likely to follow. Robert A. Dahl has argued that democratization specifically refers to the institutionalization of political opposition on the national and local level.\(^{14}\) Taiwanese political scientist Huang Te-fu picks up this argument and stresses that no government, no matter its political orientation, can completely avoid opposition challenges. The real democratic status of a nation is determined by whether or not

---

\(^{13}\) Larry Diamond, Juan J. Linz, and Seymour Martin Lipset, *Politics in Developing Countries Comparing Experiences With Democracy*, Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 1990, pp. 6-7.

political opposition is protected and institutionalized for political competition which 
endorses the peaceful transition of political power.\textsuperscript{15}

Based on the above, the emergence of opposition parties can be regarded as a 
key part of the dynamic process of democratization. Researching how an opposition 
party emerges may help in examining other key factors of democratization.

Dankwart Rustow reasoned that democratization starts with a continuous 
political struggle between two or more political groups.\textsuperscript{16} As for resolving political 
struggle, Gerardo L. Munck argues that democratic transition advances through a 
series of bargains between the current rulers and opposition leaders that gradually 
define a pattern of negotiation.\textsuperscript{17} Thus, based on these arguments, an opposition party 
is likely to emerge as a product of negotiations between two political groups (the 
rulers and opposition leaders) after a prolonged political struggle in which both sides 
eventually recognize that neither one can conclusively and finally eliminate its 
adversary.

Maurice Duverger's classic study of political parties claims that a single party

\textsuperscript{15} Te-fu Huang, “Electoral Competition and Democratic Transition in the Republic of 

\textsuperscript{16} Dankwart Rustow, “Transitions to Democracy: Toward a Dynamic Model,” 

\textsuperscript{17} Gerardo L. Munck, “Democratic Transitions in Comparative Perspective,” 
Comparative Politics, April 1994, p. 358.
system can be compatible with democracy. And in recent years, some Asianists have labeled factional competition within such one-party systems as a culturally appropriate "Asian" form of democracy. But Giovanni Sartori, holding a different opinion, argues that power competition within a single ruling party does not constitute a democracy. For that, a legal transfer of power between ruling and opposition parties is essential. Opposition parties must be strong and independent. Also, these parties must be allowed to operate voluntarily and without government control if democracy is to flourish. In Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, and many other Asian countries as well, state corporatist controls have stunted the development of autonomous associational life, and thus of democracy.

Scanning Taiwan's politics with the above arguments in mind, the emergence of the first opposition party, the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP), constitutes a milestone on the road to a politically competitive environment and, subsequently, democratization. Among the world's major Chinese societies, Taiwan has achieved by far the greatest progress toward democratization. Instead of a sudden shift to

20 Larry Diamond, Juan J. Linz, and Seymour Martin Lipset, pp. 21-22.
21 Ibid., p. 23.
democracy by a radical revolution as in other third world countries in Latin America and Africa, Taiwan has been able to make a remarkably stable transition towards democracy. This culminated on March 23, 1996 with Taiwan’s first-ever free, competitive, multi-party presidential election, won by President Lee Teng-hui. Thus, examining how Taiwan’s ruling party -- the Kuomintang (KMT) -- gradually relinquished power to create a competitive party system nurturing democracy may help in understanding how Chinese, Confucian, and even other non-Asian authoritarian societies can become more democratic.

Regarding the question of why transitions occur, the influential O’Donnell-Schmitter model argues that the emergence of a schism between hard-liners and soft-liners within regimes is the main reason for the initiation of a transition.22 Like O’Donnell and Schmitter, Przeworski has also emphasized splits within a regime as a factor initiating a transition.23 Competition within Taiwan’s KMT government or ruling class has led to democratic movements, especially during the 1950s-1960s. However, these democratic movements were halted as soon as a particular regime regained sufficient power or internal unity to eliminate the initial split that sparked a movement.


I will argue, based on several rises of opposition power in Taiwan over 40 years, that the O’Donnell-Schmitter and Przeworski theory that democratic transition is generated by splits within the authority may not fully explain the case of Taiwan. These splits were not sustained or prolonged enough to restrain the KMT’s politically abusive practices. These schisms do, however, offer great insight into Taiwan’s democratic development. If a politically competitive environment is, though not the only, the most important pre-condition for modern democracy, then the manner in which an opposition power emerges and how it bargains with the authority becomes significant in studying democratic transition within a country. One problem facing Taiwan’s democratization is not when the splits happened, but rather, what eliminated the schisms that could have lead to democratic transition. The opposition power could not rely on the schisms to help create a democratic transition. How, then, did they find a way to continuously challenge the KMT?

Based on the problem above, there are two questions that need to be answered:

1. Why did schisms emerge in the KMT, and why did they disappear?

2. Why and how did the opposition form a challenging group outside the KMT, instead of combatting within the KMT?

Beginning in the 1950s, schisms began to emerge within the KMT, but were eventually eliminated, even though they repeatedly re-emerged. It reveals that there must be some liberals in the KMT, and the KMT’s repressive practices may have played an essential role in restricting these liberal-generated-schisms which may
promoting a transition toward democracy in Taiwan. As a result, persons in control of these repressive apparatuses may have the power to manipulate the speed of democratization. Whenever demands for democracy began to grow in Taiwan, the KMT's repressive apparatuses were always used to slow the speed of democratic activities. Aside from the KMT's repressive apparatus, KMT's problem of political legitimacy may be also influential in the emergence of schisms and the transition. This legitimacy problem, mainly cased by martial law and the "Temporary Provisions"²⁴ led to the restriction of political participation and suppression of the dissent from the KMT liberals, and also delayed transition. Thus, the KMT's repressive apparatus, disunity among its leaders, and its legitimacy problems all contributed to the schisms' emergence and termination.

Since there was no space for the opposition to emerge within the KMT, it would be obvious that the opposition may jump out and associated with some indigenous forces to challenge the KMT from the outside. This strategic change of the opposition highlights the issue of ethnicity, which was used by the opposition to gain the force on the popular base in challenging the KMT.

A review of the following events in Taiwan shows that ethnic differences, emerging generations of opposition, and the use of KMT-sponsored publications to promote oppositionist ideals all led to the push for transition. Ethnicity, especially for

²⁴ See also Chapter II, "The Challenges to Opposition in Taiwan: Factors Conditioning the Rise of Organized Opposition".
the Taiwanese who represent 85% of the population in Taiwan, was a dynamic force in rallying opposition against a repressive regime. Opposition magazines were also instrumental in assembling and organizing opposition power. Most important, the emergence of successive new generations of oppositionists was also a stimulus in democratic transition. Because they were young and educated, new generations of opposition not only guaranteed the continuity of the opposition movements, but also ensured effective challenges to the KMT’s authority.

After briefly reviewing the significant periods in Taiwan’s post-1945 politics, this thesis will examine the most influential factors of transition, and then use these factors to examine those political events that answer the above questions.

Historical Overview of Taiwan

After 1945, Taiwan’s democratic development made few advances until the 1970s under the rule of the Leninist KMT. During the 1970s, however, Taiwan showed marvelous speed toward democratic transition. This remarkable progress toward democracy does not simply mean there was a worldwide inclination toward actual democratization, but rather that there was a trend toward bargaining between the KMT regime and opposition.

The development of a credible opposition movement in Taiwan can be broken down into four major periods. These periods include (1) The period of the “228

25 The overview of these four events is extracted from following publications:
Incident” (1947: February 27~ March 17), (2) The period of the Free China Incident (1949-1960), (3) The University Incident (1968-1973), and (4) the emergence of the TangWai political group and the establishment of the first opposition party -- the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) (1975-1988).26

The 228 Incident

The 228 Incident involved a conflict between the police and Taiwanese citizens on February 27, 1947. It was sparked by a ban on private tobacco in Taipei. Although it initially was merely an episode of civil unrest that had occurred thousands of times in Taiwan, the situation ultimately escalated into a riot that spread throughout the island on February 28. The 228 Incident, named after the date when the riot began, was finally suppressed by the KMT’s military, while many Taiwanese

---


26 These four events reveal the sequence of Taiwan’s democratic movements. They all opened the opportunities for the rise of opposition, and also confronted the repression or intervention of the KMT authority. Most of all, they were experiences that help the oppositionists adjust their strategy in challenging the KMT regime.
elites were either arrested or murdered, or they simply disappeared.

Basically, the 228 Incident was generally regarded as a tactic of the KMT to solidify its coercive control in Taiwan, and an attempt to destroy any potential opposition leadership base. Further, though the KMT had consolidated its authority, this incident deepened the separation between Taiwanese and mainlanders. This separation was eventually used by oppositionists as an indigenous stimulus for founding an opposition party --- the DPP in 1980s. After the 228 Incident, the KMT effectively suppressed any opposition power outside its own regime. However, another opponent, the Free China group, gradually emerged from within the KMT ranks during the 1950s.

The Free China Incident

In the beginning, the magazine Free China, founded and led by one of Chiang Kai-shek’s intimates Lei Chen (雷震) and a famous scholar Hu Shih (胡適), was sponsored by the KMT. It was a publication used by the KMT to attack Communism and to build support among the people. In 1951, Free China began to promote more controversial views, touching issues that were considered taboo by the KMT. The changing Free China opened a channel for opposition voices to be heard in a government-sanctioned forum. Along with these changes, in 1960, Free China began to build links with native Taiwanese elites, and offer them a forum to be heard during

---

27 About Lei Chen and Hu Shih, see also Chapter III, Free China section.
the elections for provincial representatives. This move provided an opportunity for potential opponents to organize and build political networks.

During 1959 and 1960, Free China’s advocacy of constitutional revision and the establishment of a new party caused some in the KMT to suspect Free China of directly challenging its power. This was the first time the KMT repressed an opposition split in Taiwan. On September 4th, 1960, Free China was dissolved by KMT, and its chief leader, Lei Chen, was accused of “advocating Communism,” and sentenced to ten years in prison.

The closure of Free China silenced the voice of the opposition power for one decade, until the emergence of a new magazine group called The University.

The University Incident

The University magazine was first published in January 1968. During its early days, The University only discussed culture and art. Beginning in 1971, under the sponsorship of the KMT Central Party Bureau (中央黨部), many of the KMT’s young intellectuals joined and reorganized The University, and began to examine domestic political policies. The reorganization of The University not only reopened a channel for political criticism, but also meant that new generations of Taiwan’s opposition could emerge. Using their intellectual backgrounds, the opposition power was able to battle the KMT on more sensitive and professional issues. The criticisms by The University group had a great impact on college campuses.
Regardless, the political climate of Taiwan caused by The University again raised the KMT's suspicions. KMT's repressive apparatus demonstrated its strength when dealing with The University group. After the Incident of the Department of Philosophy of NTU in 1973, The University magazine began to decline.

In spite of the decline of The University, opposition activities continued, defying KMT intervention. In 1973, some of The University's core members began to work with Taiwanese local leaders, and eventually formed the TangWai political group in 1975.

The TangWai Political Group and DPP

In August 1975, Taiwanese local leaders Huang Hsin-chieh (黃信介) and K’ang Ning-hsiang (康寧祥) associated themselves with liberal intellectuals to publish The Taiwan Political Review (臺灣政論). Henceforth, the term “TangWai” was numerous used in articles of The Taiwan Political Review to label the oppositionists those who are “outside the party” (e.g. the KMT). This group pushed the opposition power to a semi-party level.

The most important characteristic of the TangWai was that almost every member was Taiwanese. This was the first instance in which ethnicity was used, by

---

28 Due to the intervention of KMT's intelligence agents, 14 teachers of NTU's Philosophy Department, also members of The University, were dismissed. About this Incident, see also Chapter Three, The University section.
way of public elections,\textsuperscript{29} to rally political support. By stressing their ethnic background, the oppositionists transformed their power base from within the KMT to public elections and successfully consolidated their power, which now flowed from the populace. This kind of power base gradually became an effective weapon for oppositionists when bargaining with the KMT. It was this power base that accelerated the Tang Wai group to found the first opposition party (the DPP) in 1988.

The following chapter will begin to explore some factors influential to Taiwan's democratization and explain how crucial they were during the above-mentioned periods. The third and fourth chapters will mainly focus on the history of these events. By examining each, one will confirm the relationship between democratization and the factors elaborated in Chapter II. Based on these factors, some questions are going to be raised when stressing the importance of Taiwan's ethnicity, and I will also induce certain strategic considerations of Taiwanese oppositionists in the Conclusion.

\textsuperscript{29} The KMT began to hold "Supplementary Elections" since 1972; see also Chapter IV.
CHAPTER II

THE CHALLENGES TO OPPOSITION IN TAIWAN: FACTORS CONDITIONING THE RISE OF ORGANIZED OPPOSITION

The efforts of native Taiwanese oppositionists to develop an organized, effective opposition to the KMT between 1945 and 1995 were conditioned by many forces. This chapter will provide an overview of several key conditioning factors. These include:

1. The KMT's shifting and evolving policy toward potential opposition:

In the late 1940s and early 1950s, the KMT's elimination of the condition for political competition created major legitimacy problems for Taiwan's new ruling party. Foremost among these were the declaration of martial law\textsuperscript{30} and the politically repressive "Temporary Provisions Effective During the Period of Communist Rebellion" (動員戡亂時期臨時條款).\textsuperscript{31} This martial law, declared in May 1949,

\textsuperscript{30} Ch'en Yang-te (陳陽德), Three Crucial Issues of Politics in Current Taiwan (臺灣當前三大政治問題), Taipei: Tzu-Li Evening Post (自立晚報), 1992, p.10. On May 20th, 1949, after the KMT withdrew from mainland China to Taiwan, Taiwan’s governor and commander of garrison force (省主席和警備總司令) -- Ch’en Ch’eng (陳誠) proclaimed Martial Law.

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid.. Along with martial law, the "Temporary Provisions" was also legislated during the session of the first National Assembly. It froze the 39th and 49th clauses of the Constitution, which address the tenures of congressman and single reelection of presidency, and gave a legitimate source of power for current legislators, national representatives, and members in Control Yuan to continually exercise their duty in
gave the Taiwan Garrison Command Force (警備總部) the inspection power to limit people's civil rights, including freedom of speech, publication, gathering, and association, given by the Constitution of 1947.

Between 1947 and the late 1980s, in response to its evolving legitimacy problems, KMT's policies wavered back and forth between extreme repression and infiltration of opposition groups, and efforts to tolerate and even co-opt dissident mainland intellectual and ethnic Taiwanese elites into the KMT. Although the overall trend of the time was from repression toward greater co-optation, the policy, like any reform effort, at times took significant steps backward toward repression.

Regardless, because of the closed nature of KMT policy-making, the exact reasons for the KMT's shifting and evolving policy toward opposition are difficult to specify precisely. To a great extent, the policy reflected the evolving views of the KMT's main leader in this policy area, Chiang Kai-shek's son Chiang Ching-kuo. Increasingly over this period, Chiang Ching-kuo recognized the need for the KMT to find some way of winning support among the increasingly prosperous and powerful

Taiwan. It made the National Assembly, the Legislative Yuan, and the Control Yuan the three non-reelection, life-long Congresses. Under this Temporary Provision, the channels of political participation, especially on the national level, were totally locked from the citizens. Moreover, it also exempted the president from the restrictions of the one re-election rule mentioned in the Constitution. After martial law and the "Temporary Provisions" were proclaimed, opposition and critics lost their channels of influence. Thus, taking advantage of KMT's publication to advocate liberalism was one of the very few ways that opposition elites could push Taiwan toward a more competitive environment. The Free China and University were both obvious evidences that Taiwan's government was being challenged.
ethnic Taiwanese community. To some extent, the wavering policy also reflected the ebb and flow of KMT leadership politics—- in particular Chiang Ching-kuo’s need to respond to conservative KMT leaders’ fear about losing power within the party and the three legislative bodies. Internationally, the KMT was forced to change some of its policies to differentiate itself from the mainland government, to correspond with its increasingly isolated international status after 1971 (when the ROC withdrew from the United Nations), and also to cater to the pressure from the U.S. for increasing human rights protection in Taiwan. Finally, the policy may also have been influenced by bureaucratic tensions and disagreements between more hard-line leaders in three Congresses and National Security Bureau, and more co-optationist leaders in the KMT’s Central Party Bureau. By the 1980s, this bureaucratic tension was personified between two of Chiang Ching-kuo’s top aids: Director of the Department of Political Work in Ministry of National Defense (國防部總政治作戰部主任) Wang Sheng, and KMT General Secretary Li Huan.

2. The rise of the opposition was also shaped by generational factors, which gave oppositionists new sources from which to recruit leadership.

In the early years of KMT rule, the major force for opposition came from mainland intellectuals. These mainland intellectual’s influence with KMT leaders gave them access to legitimate, though highly constrained channels through which to criticize the KMT government-- most notably through KMT-sponsored intellectual magazines such as Free China and The University. Later in the early period of the
TangWai, however, these mainlander intellectuals were joined by a variety of ethnic Taiwanese oppositionists, including Taiwanese intellectuals and local Taiwanese political leaders. After the 1979 Formosa Incident, native Taiwanese took over opposition activities, and two new generations, attorney groups and the relatives of Formosa Incident victims, became main streams among oppositionists.

The key point here is that each of these sources of opposition had its own distinctive power bases, interests, and demands. These changing power bases, interests, and demands, in turn, constantly reshaped the nature, direction, and effectiveness of the opposition.

3. A final key factor shaping the rise of the opposition was the gradual development of Taiwanese identity and the rise of what became known as a “Taiwanese Ideology”.

This ideology tended to see all members of the massively diverse mainland Chinese leadership as one common “foreign-born” group in opposition to the native, ethnic Taiwanese. This Taiwanese ideology also questioned and challenged, with increasing openness and ferocity, the legitimacy of the KMT’s claimed right to rule Taiwan--a claim which was based on its broader claim that they were the rightful government of all China temporarily based in Taiwan. In contrast, the Taiwanese Ideology increasingly called for the recognition of the real state of political affairs after 1949, that there was one China, and one Taiwan.

To understand why the above-mentioned factors are crucial, it is necessary to examine each more closely.
As mentioned, martial law and the "Temporary Provisions" limited political participation in Taiwan. Moreover, they also created a political environment for the KMT to monopolize power without organized competition. To reinforce a power monopoly under a political system whose legitimacy is suspect, the KMT needed to install a repressive apparatus as a means of rule, in particular, a well-developed system of secret agents. Throughout the history of Taiwan's opposition movement, the KMT intelligence agencies have played an essential role. Whenever or wherever an opposition movement has sprung up, the KMT's secret repressive forces have always intervened. After the 228 Incident, there was no doubt the KMT had created a rule of terror, carried out by secret agents, throughout Taiwan. The power of the secret agents stretched into every public or private organization. Quite simply, the whole of Taiwan was under the inspection and control of the intelligence agencies.

There has not been a single professional article or publication that has detailed the framework of the organization of secret agents. However, one source, The Archives of Intelligence (情報檔案), described by former Investigation Bureau Vice Director Kao Ming-hui (高明輝) and recorded by Fan Li-ta (范立達), is still very

---

helpful in developing a general picture of Taiwan’s intelligence organizations.

Before 1949, there were many official organizations executing the work of information collection. Regarding the diversity of intelligence organizations, Chiang Ching-kuo established a “Committee of Revolutionary Action” (革命行動委員會) in 1950 to integrate these organizations. This committee existed in the Presidential Office under the euphemistic name of the “Data Group of the Confidential Affairs Office” (機要室資料組). Although this committee only held the rank of “Group” within the presidential office, it dominated all intelligence organizations, including the Investigation Bureau (調查局), the Headquarters of Military Police (憲兵司令部), Ministry of National Defense (國防部), the Taiwan Provincial Police Bureau (臺灣省警察局), and the Taiwan Garrison Command Headquarters (臺灣省警備總部). The first general secretary of this “Data Group” was Ch’en Shih (陳師). Ch’en Shih, not coincidentally, was a classmate of Chiang Ching-kuo from his days studying in Russia. Considering this relationship, it seems fair to conclude that Chiang Ching-kuo was probably the real head boss of this “Data Group.”

Along with integrating the intelligence organizations, Chiang also established the “Shih P’ai Classes” (石牌班) to

---

33 Kao Ming-hui (高明輝), The Archives of the Secret Agent (情報檔案), Taipei: Shang-Chou Culture Press (商周文化出版社), 1995, pp. 133-135; It is common knowledge that Chiang Ching-kuo could not hand KMT’s most effective repression instrument out to someone he did not trust. Although Ch’en Shih was the director of this “Data Group”, he was generally believed to be Chiang’s watch dog, and Chiang retained his influence within this Group.
recruit and train new secret agents. In 1955, the “Data Group” was changed into “The Convention of National Defense” (國防會議). Under the Convention was the “National Security Bureau” (國安局). It was this “National Security Bureau” that later took charge in all intelligence organizations. The chart in Appendix A illustrates the framework of Taiwan’s intelligence organizations.

It is hard for citizens living in democratic countries to imagine the power of an intelligence apparatus in a Leninist authoritarian regime such as Taiwan. Generally speaking, the KMT agents penetrated Taiwan’s society and operated quite well. In classic Leninist organizational fashion, every public organization contained a “Security Office” (安全室) which was composed of intelligence agents, investigating and evaluating the loyalty of public officers. No public organization, from primary schools, to Labor Unions, to the central government, could hide from the eyes of the secret agents. In the late 1970s, the “Security Offices” faced huge dissension from public officers and was officially closed. But the secret agents continued to exist and became known as “The Personnel Department Second Office” (人事室第二辦公室: 人二室). In this respect, monitoring of loyalty was undertaken by personnel offices, as in the Mainland Chinese system. Although the “Security Office” and “the

34 Ibid., pp. 265-271.
Personnel Department Second Office” were institutionalized as a part of every public organization, they were directly commanded not by the organizations they belonged to executively, but by the Investigation Bureau. Anyone suspected of disloyalty by the intelligence apparatus suffered difficulties in his/her career--- demotion or even imprisonment.

This internal security system also built very large networks of informers to inspect ordinary citizens. Setting informers was called “Bu Chian” (布建) in Chinese. In Kao Ming-hui’s book, he suggested that a ratio for infiltration was one informer out of every 500 ordinary people (每五百人中有一布建人員). A special group of secret agents was even organized to keep a 24 hour-a-day watch on certain important figures such as opposition leaders. Internationally, the special agents formed a “Black Names List” or “Control List” (黑名單 or 管制名單), which mainly prevented some opposition figures from returning to Taiwan. This Control List ensured the exile of many key opposition leaders, like P’eng Ming-min (彭明敏).

37 Ibid., pp.169-178.
38 Opposition leaders like Lei Chen and P’eng Ming-min were treated by secret agent’s “powerful tracing” (威力跟監), even though they were released from prison. Later, some TangWai leaders also guarded by the same way.
40 about P’eng Ming-min, see also the “Taiwanese Ideology” section.
and Hsu Hsin-liang (許信良),\textsuperscript{41} for more than ten years.

Certainly, during its period of rule on Taiwan, the KMT created a much more effective, powerful, and institutionalized intelligence organizations than it did during its years ruling mainland China. As a result, every domestic organization in Taiwan was penetrated by KMT agents.

\textbf{Chiang Ching-kuo’s Attitude}

While Chiang Ching-kuo controlled the Investigation and Statistics Bureaus under the KMT’s of Central Party and Military Committees (中央黨部調查統計局 & 軍事委員會調 \textsuperscript{42} 查統計局) in the early 1950s, all of Taiwan became the dominion of the secret agent.\textsuperscript{42} The \textit{Free China} Incident revealed a painful truth: In the 1950s and 60s, Chiang Ching-kuo adopted a highly repressive policy toward all forms of opposition.\textsuperscript{43}

Before becoming the Prime Minister in 1971, Chiang Ching-kuo attempted to maintain an illusion of democracy to gain the supports of intellectuals. As mentioned, the KMT headquarters supported and financially backed \textit{The University} group. Thus,

\textsuperscript{41} about Hsu Hsin-liang, see also Chapter IV.

\textsuperscript{42} Hu Fo, (interview, 22nd August, 1995), Professor, Department of Political Science, NTU., maintained close relations with Lei Chen’s families and members of \textit{The University}, also one of the mediating scholars between the KMT and TangWai in 1988.

\textsuperscript{43} about the \textit{Free China} Incident, see also Chapter III: Opposition Organization in the 1950s--The Rise and Fall of \textit{Free China} and \textit{The University}.
the new generations of oppositionists, who were mostly intellectuals educated during the post-war period, were able to advocate democracy through KMT-sponsored channels. Besides escorting Chiang’s succession, The University also played a role in emitting dissent from the intelligentsia when the ROC was turned out of the United Nations in 1971. However, Chiang Ching-kuo did not totally stop his suppressive apparatus operations during The University period. He utilized secret agents on a small scale to slow the tide of democratic demands flowing from the campuses into Taiwan society. In December 1972, after the “Meeting of Nationalism” (民族主義座談會) was held at National Taiwan University (NTU) to advocate human rights and constitutional reforms, 14 teachers who taught in the department of Philosophy were investigated by secret agents and eventually dismissed. This was the so-called “Incident at NTU’s Philosophy Department” (台大哲學系事件).

After this incident, the democratic upsurge from campuses, and the demands of political reform from The University Group, was finally quieted by the intervention of Chiang’s secret agents.

During the late 1960s, due to the aging of the “permanently” elected congressmen protected under the “Temporary Provisions”, the KMT gradually began to recognize that the orthodoxy it had established could not last forever. Thus, to

---

44 Li Shiao-feng (李筱峰), The Taiwan’s Democratic Movements in Past Forty Years (臺灣民主運動四十年) 5th ed., p. 106.

45 KMT’s orthodoxy relied on three non-reelected, life-long congresses (National Assembly, Legislative Yuan, and Control Yuan), whose members were elected before 1949 when KMT withdrew from the mainland China. After 1949, KMT used them to claim its continuous orthodoxy from mainland China to Taiwan under the protection
renew its hold on power, the KMT held a “Supplementary election” in 1969 to add some new life-long congressmen to the three non-reelected congresses.\textsuperscript{46} However, this “Supplementary election” could not resolve the paradox of these life-long congresses; that is, the representatives of the congresses could not effectively represent the people in mainland areas the KMT still claimed to rule.\textsuperscript{47} Preparing to succeed his father, Chiang Ching-kuo could not completely ignore pressure from conservatives within the three congresses who rejected total reelection. On the other hand, Chiang still recognized the importance of Taiwanese elites in Taiwan’s future. He also felt pressure from Taiwan’s increasing diplomatic isolation after 1971. As a result of these forces, Chiang’s attitude changed dramatically during the early 1970s. In order to obtain support from the Taiwanese elites, give Taiwan a more democratic image, and thus differentiate it from the mainland Chinese Communist government, Chiang launched a “Taiwanization Policy”\textsuperscript{48} to promote certain educated Taiwanese to the KMT’s decision making and legislative organizations.

\begin{itemize}
\item[46] About the three non-reelected congresses, see also note # 31.
\item[47] Masatake Wakabayashi (若林正丈), Democratization in a Divided Country (臺灣：分裂國家與民主化), Taipei: Hsueh-ying Culture Press (學英文化出版社), 1994, p.180. (Translated from the original Japan edition “Higashiazia no Kokka to Syakai 2 Taiwan”, published in 1992 by the University of Tokyo Press, Tokyo, Japan.)
\item[48] Ibid., p. 183. “Taiwanization” is the generic name of KMT’s personnel policies during the early 1970s. In the beginning, Chiang also faced opposition to his Taiwanization policy from within the KMT conservative leadership, especially the pressure from the members of three life-long congresses.
\end{itemize}
This was the reason why some staff members on The University, especially the Taiwanese, were co-opted into the KMT in 1973. This is also why the KMT decided to hold the “Supplementary Elections During the Period of Communist Rebellion” (動員勘亂時期增額選舉) in 1972.

Although the “Supplementary Elections” could not immediately resolve the problem of legitimacy, they at least raised political participation to the national level. The expansion of political participation provided local Taiwanese elites with the opportunity to get into the national congresses.

Despite the Taiwanization Policy, Taiwan did not make smooth progress toward democratization before 1980. Two of Chiang’s followers played crucial roles and determined the irregular path of change during this period. One was Li Huan (李煥), in charge of the party organization, and the other was Wang Sheng (王昇), responsible for the military and secret agencies. When Chiang advocated Taiwanization in the early 1970s, he promoted Li Huan to the chief of KMT’s Organizational Work Committee (組織工作會). Li began executing the Taiwanization Policy, employing the instruments of co-optation. But the electoral victory of many TangWai candidates in 1977 suggested that the “Taiwanization Policy” was not able to gain so strong support from Taiwanese as Chiang had expected. As a result of the 1977 elections, Li Huan was removed from his post and transferred to the post of President of National Sun-Yat-Sen University. Li’s removal increased Wang Sheng’s power in Chiang’s regime. The rise of Wang Sheng also led
to the decline of Taiwanization Policy and later the establishment of the “Liu Shao K’ang Office” (LSKO: 劉少康辦公室) in 1979. The LSKO was the supreme organization which integrated the secret agents under Wang Sheng’s command.\(^\text{49}\) Due to these circumstances, Wang adopted different ways to manage the opposition problem. These were also crucial reasons why the KMT would use military force to suppress demonstration during the 1979 “Formosa Incident” (美麗島事件).

During the 1970s, the factional disagreements between hard-liner and co-optationist leaders made Chiang’s evolving attitude towards democratization even more difficult to trace. Looking at the suppression and arrests during the Formosa Incident, it is hard to say that Chiang had decided to decisively move Taiwan toward democratization. But, the death of Taiwanese-American professor Chen Wen-cheng and the Chiang Nan Incident\(^\text{50}\) harmed the U.S.-ROC relations and also undermined the credibility of hard-line lieutenants such as Wang Sheng in Chiang Ching-kuo’s eyes. Beginning in 1983, believing it was more effective to regulate, rather than just repress, the opposition, Chiang removed the Wang Sheng and proposed a policy called “Political Renovation” (政治革新) to articulate his willingness to move toward political democratization. On April 9th 1986, the “12 Person Group on Political

\(^{49}\) Ibid., pp. 183-84; LSKO (劉少康辦公室) was merely a pseudonym and a informal institution within the KMT party organization. Since 1969, it directed the operations of KMT’s Central Standing Committee and obtained a nickname called “Little Central Standing Committee” (小中常會), which had the power to pre-examine every proposal before the meeting of Central Standing Committee.

\(^{50}\) See also Chapter IV.
Renovation” (政治革新十二人小組) was formed and began drafting a Civic Organizations Law which would permit the formation of a legally organized opposition party.\(^{51}\)

The KMT’s evolving willingness to accept open opposition was dramatically underscored in September 1986. Tired of waiting for the Civic Organizations Law to take effect, the TangWai group jumped the gun and announced the formation of the “Democratic Progressive Party” (DPP) --- still technically illegal under the Temporary Provisions. But rather than arrest the new DPP leaders, Chiang Ching-kuo tolerated the party’s establishment. The KMT simply announced that the police could not outlaw the DPP because it was not a formal party, but an political organization in the “preparing period” (準備階段).\(^{52}\) On July 15th, 1987, Chiang made his final arrangements to lift martial law. This arrangement finally legalized and regulated the DPP in the political system. Chiang died shortly thereafter, in early 1988, leaving Taiwan-born Lee Teng-hui as President.

**Generational Factors**

The opposition to the KMT during the Free China period reflected the ideals of two very different interest groups: mainlander intellectuals (who were often


\(^{52}\) Ibid., 221.
assumed to be or accused by the KMT of being Communist infiltrators) and local Taiwanese elites. These two groups had distinct grievances against Chiang Kai-shek's regime, but both were persecuted for their opposition.

Free China was originally an association of mainlander intellectuals. Because of their intelligentsia background and general lack of command of the Taiwanese language, their liberal ideals could not reach a broad public base in Taiwan. However, these ideologies of democracy and liberty, and their challenges to the KMT's authority generated much sympathy among Taiwan's indigenous elites. Some important Taiwanese elites who associated with Free China were representatives of the provincial assembly, including: Lee Wan-chu (李萬居), Kuo Kuo-chi (郭國基), Wu San-lien (吳三連), Lee Yuan-chan (李源楨), Kuo Yu-hsin (郭雨新), and Hsu Shih-hsien (許世賢).

The members of Free China constituted what we call the "old generation" of oppositionists. Beginning with The University period, new generations of oppositionist began to emerge. These new generations' emergence reflected the changes in recruitment base, demands, and interests available to KMT critics.

The University was a group which was composed of post-war born oppositionists. Moreover, this group could be divided into two different subgroups.

---

53 Li Shiao-feng (李筱峰), In and Out Of History (進出歷史), p. 168.

54 Ibid., pp. 168-169.
One was the men of letters, like Ch’en Shao-t’ing (陳少廷), Ch’iu Hung-ta (丘宏達), and Yang Kuo-shu (楊國樞); the other was the businessmen, like Chang Shao-wen (張紹文) and Kao Chih-liang.\(^{55}\) This combination, different from Free China’s, demonstrated that the middle class had become the politically active core of Taiwan’s society. However, a more notable characteristic of The University was the increase of Taiwanese in the editorial staff. There were no Taiwanese editors on Free China’s staff. Contrariwise, 17 Taiwanese editors joined The University in 1971. A majority of Taiwanese in The University ensured that the post-war Taiwanese generations would rapidly expand their percentage among oppositionists.

Another stream of the opposition power-- the local Taiwanese leaders, different from The University which was fostered by the KMT -- was also active during the 1970s. In December 1969, Taipei held its first election when it became a special municipality (直轄市) under Central Government’s direct jurisdiction. In this election, a local Taiwanese leader who would later emerge as one of the great TangWai leaders, K’ang Ning-hsiang (康寧祥), was elected as a representative to the Taipei Assembly. At the same time, under K’ang’s assistance, Huang Hsin-chieh (黃信介), another local Taiwanese leader, was also elected to the Legislative Yuan. The victorious Taiwanese leaders even caught the attention of the United States

---

\(^{55}\) Li Shiao-feng (李筱峰), *In and Out Of History* (進出歷史), p. 195; For more about these figures, see also Table 4 in Chapter IV.
government.\textsuperscript{56} In December, 1970, in association with Huang Hsin-chieh’s brother, Huang Tien-fu (黃天福), K’ang ran in the first supplementary election of central public representatives and was elected as a legislator. During this election, Huang Tien-fu was also elected as a representative to the National Assembly.\textsuperscript{57}

In early 1973, the local Taiwanese leaders, for the first time, began to join organizational forces with the opposition intellectuals. When The University began to decline, Chang Chun-hung (張俊宏), a main editor of the publication, left the KMT and joined the election race for the Taipei Assembly.\textsuperscript{58} These oppositionists sought an organization in which to work together. But under the “Temporary Provisions,” the formation of an officially organized competitive political “party” was strictly banned. Hence, the ingenious name “TangWai” (Outside of the [KMT] Party) was first proposed by the association of Taiwanese elites who ran the campaign during this election—“The United Front of Four Candidates Outside of the Party” (黨外四人聯合陣線).

After the 1979 Formosa Incident, almost all of the most important TangWai members were arrested, and eight Formosa magazine core staffers were put on

\textsuperscript{56} In June, 1970, the Department of the State of the U.S. Federal Government invited K’ang to visit the U.S.

\textsuperscript{57} Li Shiao-feng (李筱峰), The Taiwan’s Democratic Movements in Past Forty Years.(臺灣民主運動四十年) 5th ed., p.113.

\textsuperscript{58} Ibid., p.114.
military trial.⁵⁹ These Formosa core figures were sentenced from 12 years to life in the infamous prison at Green Island.

Although most of the TangWai elites were jailed, ironically, the attorneys representing the Formosa victims became the future arm of the TangWai movement. Besides the attorney group, the relatives of the Formosa victims also became a stout power in the future opposition. Many of these relatives ran campaigns and obtained a great number of votes in the national representatives elections in 1980 and 1983. Together with the attorneys, these two opposition forces gradually became the hard core of opposition power, and eventually the founders of the DPP in 1987.

Ethnicity

The rise of Taiwan's opposition was also, of course, shaped by ethnic problems which originated mainly from the island's modern history and the brutality of early KMT rule. Ethnicity in modern Taiwan is based on a very complex process by which the Taiwanese people came to feel a common sense of nationalism, and to see another group of people (mainlanders) as “hated outsiders”. This nationalism also comes from the majority Taiwanese peoples’ cultural origins, family education, and political socialization, all of which differ from those of the ruling minority mainlanders. The mainlander KMT’s suppression of Taiwanese political power,

⁵⁹ According to the ROC’s Martial Law, rebellion criminals must be accused and adjudged in the Military Court, not civilian court.
accompanied with Taiwan’s uncertain future and international status, accelerated the rise of Taiwanese nationalism. Taiwan’s opposition used this politically taboo force to organize support, and gradually developed a “Taiwanese Ideology”, which advocated the island’s independence. This nationalist ideology proved to be a much stronger means to organize the opposition in the democratic struggle. This brief section cannot do justice to the complex origins and development of Taiwan’s ethnic issues. The key point, for this study, is the great power of ethnicity for organizing the opposition.

Provincial Origins

In their major cross-national analysis of democratization, Diamond, Linz, and Lipset stress the dangers of the failure of authoritarian and democratizing governments to accommodate ethno-nationalist pressures, as occurred under the KMT.

One of the stronger generalizations emerging from our larger study is the danger for democracy of excessive centralization of state power. Where there are major ethnic or regional cleavages that are territorially based, the relationship is by now self-evident and axiomatic: The absence of provisions for the devolution and decentralization of power, especially in the context of ethnoregional disparities, feeds ethnic insecurity, violent conflict, and even secessionist pressures. These, in turn, are poisonous to democracy.60

In Taiwan, the problem of ethnoregional cleavages turns on the issue of

60 Larry Diamond, Juan J. Linz, Seymour Martin Lipset, Politics in Developing Countries: Comparing Experiences with Democracy, p. 29.
Before discussing the provincial origins, it is necessary to differentiate between Taiwanese and mainlanders. Although there were over 35 provinces when the KMT dominated mainland China, the issue of provincial origins distinguishes and defines only two ethnic groups in Taiwan, the Taiwanese and Mainlanders. In other words, despite the huge, rich ethnic and linguistic diversity among mainlanders, the Taiwanese saw all or almost all of them as one group.

It is generally acknowledged that "Taiwanese" are made up of two groups: aboriginals and those mainland Chinese whose ancestors fled to Taiwan during the early Qing Dynasty (1644-1911) such as the Minnan people (閩南人) and the Hakka people (客家). These so-called Taiwanese lived under the rule of Japan for 50 years (1895-1945). Different from the Taiwanese, mainlanders are those Chinese who fled to Taiwan during the struggle between the KMT and Chinese Communist Party (CCP) from 1945-1949.

After the mainlanders came to Taiwan, because of the separations in culture and language, they could not blend into Taiwan's society immediately. Thus, for social and political purposes, there remained two distinct ethnic groups, the Taiwanese and the Mainlanders, existing as two separated sub-societies.

There were two factors which rigidified these two ethnic groups' opposition to each other. One was the bitter legacy of the 228 incident, and the other was the KMT's personnel standard.

The 1947 228 incident involved the massacre of about 30,000 Taiwanese
elites. In this tense atmosphere during and after the 228 Incident, "ordinary Taiwanese did not even talk to mainlanders." The KMT’s personnel standards were also based on ethnic favoritism with obvious results. After 1945, the personnel standard of the KMT’s government was "mainlanders first, Taiwanese second." When the public posts left by the exiting Japanese could not be fulfilled by the mainlanders, only then did Taiwanese have the opportunity to fill these roles. Later, the announcement of martial law and the “Temporary Provisions” eliminated the channels through which the Taiwanese could enter national congresses. This situation made it clear to the Taiwanese that provincial discrimination was in the KMT’s personnel recruitment standard.

The 228 Incident and the stalemate in increasing political participation foreshadowed the Taiwanese elites’ engagements in opposition movements.

**National Identity and Taiwanese Ideology**

Taiwan’s political difficulties originate from the culmination of ethnic and nationalist conflicts and debate. This debate further generates an important problem to

---


be considered: How do the Taiwanese majority (85% of Taiwan’s population) identify themselves.

Uncertainty about the national identity of the Taiwan island is tied to deep anxieties about the future of Taiwan. This results from a clash of nationalist visions: the Chinese nationalism manifested by the KMT and its supporters, and the Taiwanese nationalism manifested by those who advocate that Taiwan be an independent state.⁶⁴

Because of its geographic separation from China and its 20 million plus population, the island of Taiwan has its own unique character and history. It has been 100 years since China handed over Taiwan to Japan with the Treaty of Shimonoseki in 1895. During this period, the Taiwanese were politically ruled by a government on mainland China for only four years (1945-1949).⁶⁵ After 1949, the growth of Taiwanese ethnic nationalism was driven by resistance against the KMT’s authoritarian rule on one hand, and the fear of mainland Chinese military intervention on the other. Under these considerations, it is reasonable for the Taiwanese to consider themselves neither Japanese nor Chinese; that is, Taiwan has never regarded itself as a part of Japan or China. Since Taiwan has never been considered a part of China by Taiwanese, a “Sympathetic Consciousness”(同情意識)⁶⁶ emerged to

---

⁶⁴ Alan M Wachman, “Competing Identities in Taiwan”, The Other Taiwan, Armonk, N.Y., M.E. Sharpe, 1994a, p. 21.

⁶⁵ Leo Moser, Taiwan’s Future: Taiwan, China, and the World, Center for Asian Studies, Arizona: Arizona State University, 1974, p. 97.

⁶⁶ “Sympathetic Consciousness” (同情意識) refers to a pessimistic emotion that Taiwanese were secondary citizens under the rule of Japanese and Mainlanders.
motivate the Taiwanese to establish a new country of their own.

The concept of Taiwanese Ideology was considered a political taboo before the 1970s. Discussions of Taiwanese Ideology reflected feelings of anger and frustration against the KMT, and sorrow for the repressed lives they were suffering. Forbidden discussions of this topic caused the Taiwanese Ideology to become obscure but provocative. In Huang Kuo-ch’ang’s (黃國昌) Chinese Ideology and Taiwanese Ideology (中國意識與臺灣意識), he categorizes several versions of Taiwanese Ideology using sociological, historical, and psychological dimensions. However, so many varying types of Taiwanese Ideology may cloud the understanding of the particular Taiwanese Ideology that evolved during the TangWai period. According to Huang, there were three kinds of Taiwanese Ideologies that emerged after 1949: (1) indigenous Taiwanese Ideologies, (2) Taiwanese Ideology inside the system, and (3) Taiwanese Ideology outside the system. Among these three Ideologies, the third one effectively reflects the opposition’s political ideology. Huang categorizes three bases for the third Taiwanese Ideology, including: (1) the hate generated by the 228 Incident and the mainlanders’ political monopoly, (2) the fear produced by mainland China for not discontinuing its military threats to reunify Taiwan with the mainland, and (3) the push to establish a new and independent country. Actually, these three bases do not

---


68 Ibid., pp. 65-78.
exist individually. The third one especially can be regarded as a consequence of first
two bases, and also a cause of the problem of national identity.

During the 1950s, the KMT attempted to reverse the effects of 50 years of
Japanese rule. They took it upon themselves to indoctrinate the Taiwanese with
Chinese beliefs and traditions. Based on the above-mentioned “provincial
discrimination,” they viewed the native Taiwanese as different from and inferior to
the Chinese, and thus, established an authoritarian oligopoly to maintain control of
the island, disregarding the wishes and independence of the native Taiwanese.69

During the 1970s, the provincial origins functioned as a unifier under which
the oppositionists could gather and form the TangWai group. Accompanied by
Taiwanese dissatisfaction with foreign colonists (Japan and the KMT), this provincial
origin further turned into an ideology which distinguished between Taiwan and China.
This ideology, known as the Taiwanese Ideology, stresses Taiwan’s total
independence from China.

Taiwanese Ideology was first proposed by P’eng Ming-min (彭明敏), the
chairman of the Department of Political Science in the National Taiwan University,
during the early 1960s. Although he was a student of Hu Shih and also maintained a
good relationship with Chiang Kai-shek, P’eng was still jailed by the KMT, along
with his two students, Hsieh Ts’ung-min (謝聰敏) and Wei T’ing-ch’ao (魏廷朝) for
publishing the “Announcement of the Movement for Taiwan’s Self-Salvation” (台灣

69 Ibid., pp. 21-27.
In this Announcement, P’eng, drawing on the principles of International Law, declared that KMT’s representation of the whole China was a ridiculous political myth. Based on the policy of “One China and One Taiwan” (一中一臺), he asked the KMT regime to abandon its “Chinese Complex” (中國情結). P’eng was sentenced to 8 years in prison, but was released on amnesty by Chiang Kai-shek after only one year imprisonment. As soon as he was released from prison, however, KMT agents began surveilling P’eng for five years until he fled to Sweden. After his successful escape, however, P’eng was soon placed on the KMT’s “Control List” and prohibited from returning to Taiwan until 1992. The notion of “Taiwanese Ideology” was treated as a political taboo and not publicly proposed until the emergence of the TangWai group.

Although it is still illegal to publicly advocate Taiwan’s independence during the 1970s and the early 1980s, the TangWai group, mainly composed of Taiwanese, successfully utilized Taiwanese Ideology to grasp the ethnic masses and to challenge the KMT’s authority. When the United States established an official relationship with

70 P’eng Ming-min Cultural Foundation (彭明敏文教基金會), P’eng Ming-min Inspecting Taiwan (彭明敏看臺灣), Taipei: Yuan-Liu Press (遠流出版社), 1995, pp. 187-201.

71 Chinese Complex can be regarded as a cultural, racial, or historical emotion, which insists Taiwan must reunify with Mainland China.

72 P’eng Ming-min Cultural Foundation (彭明敏文教基金會), P’eng Ming-min Inspecting Taiwan (彭明敏看臺灣), pp. 294-295.
the People’s Republic of China (PRC) in December 1978, one announcement\textsuperscript{73} proposed by the TangWai group was an evident reflection of the Taiwanese Ideology. After this announcement, Taiwanese Ideology jumped onto the political platform. The TangWai, the Taiwanese, and the Independence of Taiwan loosely related to one another in the political environment since the 1970s.

Beginning in the early 1980s, the TangWai group began to propose the Act of “Self-Determination” (自民白決), which suggests that Taiwan attain independence by way of referendum, during every national election. This Act also caught on among the Taiwanese people who are dissatisfied with Taiwan’s ambiguous international status and the KMT’s power monopoly.

The above-mentioned factors hold the following implications:

1. KMT’s repressive apparatus and Chiang’s attitude indicated changes in the KMT’s power structure.

2. Generational factor strengthened the continuity of the opposition groups.

---

\textsuperscript{73} Li Shiao-feng (李筱峰), \textit{The Taiwan’s Democratic Movements in Past Forty Years} (台灣民主運動四十年) 5th ed., pp. 136-138. This announcement was called “The National Affairs Announcement of TangWai (黨外人士國是聲明).” At the end of this announcement, TangWai declared that:

In the interventions of international super power, we have jeopardized of being betrayed. Therefore, we can not help directly declare that we oppose the super power dominating the fate of other country’s citizen. We strongly suggest that our future should be decided by 1.7 million citizens in Taiwan.

(在國際強權的縱橫俾圖下，我們的命運已面臨被出賣的危機，所以我們不得不率直的申說：我們反對任何強權支配其他國家人民的命運，我們堅決主張的命運應由一千七百萬人民來決定。)
3. Ethnicity revealed a social force available for the opposition to draw upon when challenging KMT authority.

From Free China to TangWai, the interests and demands of the opposition changed from period to period. The KMT's attitude also altered to either correspond to or suppress the demands of the opposition. Ethnicity, however, always provided the opposition a strong hand with which to bargain with the KMT. The longer the opposition bargained with the KMT, the more ethnicity became a pivotal factor in the opposition movements.
CHAPTER III

THE RISE AND FALL OF FREE CHINA AND THE UNIVERSITY

Martial law and the "Temporary Provisions" provided the KMT a legal base from which to restrict freedom of speech and the establishment of an opposition party. The first serious attempt to challenge these restrictions came in 1960 when several notable intellectuals (the editorial group of Free China magazine) and local leaders (Li Wan-Chu and Wu San-lien etc.) used the Free China magazine as a base from which to form a new political party. This was the so-called Free China Incident. Later, The University group, which emerged in the 1970s, follow in the same path as Free China, by challenging the KMT's authoritarianism. These two incidents revealed an attempt by the opposition to initially organize within the KMT by using KMT-sponsored publications. By organizing within the KMT, the Free China Incident, especially, can be regarded as a factional struggle within the KMT that created a cleavage for pushing democratic transition.74

The Free China Incident: A Battle Between Liberalism and Chiang Ching-kuo

When the KMT withdrew to Taiwan, most of the KMT generals did not stay long in Taiwan. They continued to escape as long as Taiwan's international status

74 Hu Fo, interviewee, 22nd August, 1995.
remained unfavorable. Under these circumstances, Chiang Kai-shek came to rely more heavily than ever on his son, Chiang Ching-kuo. This, in turn, provided Chiang Ching-kuo with a perfect opportunity to eliminate those factions within the KMT, that might have threatened his father. At that time, the most important KMT faction that opposed Chiang Kai-shek was the CC faction, named after its two leaders Ch’en Li-fu and Ch’en Kuo-fu (陳立夫&陳果夫).\(^ {75}\) Ch’en Li-fu died soon after he arrived in Taiwan. After August, 1950, Ch’en Kuo-fu’s departure to the United States secured Chiang Ching-kuo’s leadership within the KMT. Chiang Ching-kuo, regarded as Chiang Kai-shek’s successor, believed that one cause of his father’s failure in mainland China was factional infighting when the KMT struggled with the CCP before 1949. After taking over KMT’s top-ranking intelligence organization, the “Data Group of the Confidential Affairs Office in the Presidential Office” (總統府機要室資料組), Chiang Ching-kuo reconstructed the organization of secret agents, which was mainly used to prevent dissent and factional infighting. In the early 1950s, over 50,000 secret agents were directly commanded by Chiang Ching-kuo.\(^ {76}\)

Meanwhile, the Free China magazine, led by liberals Lei Chen and Hu Shih, began to criticize the Chiang’s authoritarian rule in Taiwan. These opposed ideologies, between the Free China group (liberalism) and the Chiangs (authoritarianism), caused

\(^ {75}\) Kuo Ch’u-yin (郭格印), The Struggle History of Factions in the KMT (國民黨派系鬥爭史), Taiwan: Kuei-Kuan Press (桂冠圖書), 1993, p. 664.

\(^ {76}\) Ibid., pp. 665-666.
Free China to be regarded, by the Chiangs, as the emergence of another faction.\footnote{Ibid., p. 667.}

The very first challenge of the Free China group to the Chiangs’ authority took the form of an article titled “The Government Should Not Induce People to Commit Crimes”\footnote{This article involved the impropriety of KMT’s Financial Control Policies (金融管制政策). During the 1950s, informer of a Financial Crimes (金融罪) could be rewarded 30% of the amount involving in the crime. In order to get the reward, some secret agents induced citizens, who were not aware the law, to commit the Financial Crime. Thus, this article was also be regarded as a direct challenge of Free China to Chiang Ching-kuo’s intelligence organizations.} in June, 1951. This article annoyed the vice commander of the Taiwan Garrison Command (台灣省警備總部), P’eng Meng-ch’i (彭孟緝).\footnote{P’eng Meng-ch’i, though a vice commander, was not directed by the commander Wu Kuo-chen (吳國禎), an old friend of Lei Chen, but by Chiang Ching-kuo.} As a result, P’eng ordered special agents to surveill Lei Chen and prepare to arrest him.\footnote{Ma Chih-shiao (馬之騫), Lei Chen and Chiang Kai-shek (雷震與蔣介石), Taipei: Tzu-Li Evening Post (自立晚報), 1993, p. 60.}

This was not the last time Chiang Ching-kuo’s security system was used in a conflict with Free China. After the article, Lei Chen continued his quest to expand freedom of speech. He kept publishing more critical articles which made Chiang Ching-kuo feel Lei was creating another faction within the KMT.\footnote{Hu Fo, interview, 22nd Aug., 1995.} In 1954, the Free China published “Saving the Educational Crisis” (拯救教育危機) to criticize the
KMT's Anti-Communist Youth League (ACYL: 青年反共救國團) for penetrating campuses and violating standard education. Since it was well known that the Youth League was founded by Chiang Ching-kuo, the “Saving” article was regarded as a direct challenge to Chiang’s secret agent system, and was the main reason why Lei Chen was expelled from the KMT in December, 1954.

Undeterred, Free China continued its attacks. On October 31st, 1956, Free China published a “Special Edition Wishing Long-Life to Chiang Kai-shek on the Occasion of his Birthday” (祝壽專號). In this “Special Edition”, the Free China group suggested that Chiang Kai-shek (1) seriously selects his successor, (2) establishes a parliamentary system, and (3) nationalizes the KMT-controlled military. In June, 1957, a striking article, “An Opposition Party! An Opposition Party! An Opposition Party!” (反對黨！反對黨！反對黨！), was published to inspire the organization of an opposition power. In August, 1957, the Free China began a series entitled “Today’s Problems” (今日的問題系列), which criticized Taiwan’s military, political, economic, and educational problems. This series began with “The Problems of

---

The duties of ACYL were to use military officers in coordinating loyalty and recruiting new partisans among students.

Ma Chih-shiao (馬之驥), Lei Chen and Chiang Kai-shek (雷震與蔣介石), p. 61.

Under the authoritarian rule of the Chiangs, it was a general knowledge that the military in Taiwan was loyal to KMT but the Republic of China. In order to avoid the military becoming KMT’s repressive instrument, the Free China demanded that the military should be nationalized but “KMTlized”.

---
Returning to the Mainland” and ended with “The Problem of an Opposition Party”. From June, 1957 to May, 1960, about 28 articles focused intently on advocating and organizing an opposition party.\(^85\)

On May 18th, 1960, some local Taiwanese leaders were invited to join Free China. After an association between the mainlander intellectuals and local Taiwanese leaders was established, “The committee for electoral reform” (選舉改進座談會) was formed. This committee’s task was to push for the emergence of a Chinese Democratic Party (CDP: 中國民主黨).

After the article “The Government Should Not Induce People to Commit Crimes” was published, the KMT looked to arrest Lei Chen. However, there still were some factors for the KMT to seriously consider before doing so. Although the Free China group was led by Lei Chen, Hu Shih was still a publisher. As China’s most famous liberal thinker (especially in the U.S.), any magazine edited by Hu Shih could not easily be closed down without the risk that key U.S. supporters would regard the move as anti-democratic.\(^86\) Thus, Hu Shih was regarded as the “protecting umbrella” (保護傘) of Free China. A Free China editor Hsia Tao-p’ing (夏道平) described Hu and Lei as follows:

\(^85\) Ma Chih-shiao (馬之驊), Lei Chen and Chiang Kai-shek (雷震與蔣介石), p. 376.

\(^86\) Hu Fo, interview, 22nd Aug., 1995. At that time, Hu Shih was the ambassador and maintained a good relationship with the U.S. government. Besides, the KMT heavily relied on military and financial assistance from the US during the 1950s. This situation also made the KMT hesitant to touch Free China.
Hu Shih is the protecting umbrella, and Lei Chen is the locomotive. Without both of them, the Free China group would probably have been dismissed in June, 1951, because of the article of “The government should not induce people committing crimes” (政府不可誘人民入罪). 

In addition to Hu Shih, and Lei Chen, other core members of Free China occupied important political posts, or obtained highly regarded academic reputations, as Table 1 illustrates.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Provincial Origins</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Backgrounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hu Shih</td>
<td>Anhui</td>
<td>Ph.D., Columbia University</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>The President, Beijing U. Ambassador in the USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lei Chen</td>
<td>Chekiang</td>
<td>The Kyoto University, Japan</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Professor, National Central U. General Secretary, the Committee of Political Negotiation; Counselor, the Presidential Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yin Hai-kuang</td>
<td>Hupei</td>
<td>Southwestern United U.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Professor, NTU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsia Tao-p’ing</td>
<td>Hupei</td>
<td>Wuhan University</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Professor, Chengchih &amp; Tunghai U.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mao Tzu-shui</td>
<td>Chekiang</td>
<td>Beijing University</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Professor, NTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tai Tu-heng</td>
<td>Chekiang</td>
<td>Chentan U., Shanghai</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>General Editor, Central Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hang Li-wu</td>
<td>Anhui</td>
<td>Master, U. of Wisconsin (N/A)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Counselor, the Presidential Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Fo-ch’uan</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
<td>(mainlander)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Professor, Beijing University, Southwestern United U., and Tunghai University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch’u Ching-chou</td>
<td>Hupei</td>
<td>Commercial U., Tokyo</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>General Manager, Bank of Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nieh Hua-ling</td>
<td>Hupei</td>
<td>National Central University</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

87 Ma Chih-shiao (馬之騫), Lei Chen and Chiang Kai-shek (雷震與蔣介石), pp. 132-33.

88 There is no specific year to identify the “age” in the author’s book. Since Hu was born in 1891, one can easily identify that the year of the “age” mentioned in this table was 1960.
Table 1 – Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Provincial Origins</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Backgrounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sung Wen-ming</td>
<td>Kansu</td>
<td>Journal Junior College</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>General Editor, newspapers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fu Cheng</td>
<td>Chiangsu</td>
<td>National Taiwan University</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>College of Political Warfare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Li Shao-feng (李筱峰), In and Out Of History (進出歷史), Taiwan, Tao-hsiang Press (稻香出版社), 1992, p. 188.

Also, many regular contributors to Free China held important political positions within the KMT. These included: 89

T’ao Pai-ch’uan (陶百川): member of the Control Yuan. 90
Wang Shih-chieh (王世杰): general secretary of the presidential office.
Liu Po-k’un (劉博崑): legislator of Legislative Yuan.
Ch’i Shih-ying (齊世英): legislator of Legislative Yuan.

Scanning Lei Chen’s social circle shows even more political figures familiar with Lei. The most obvious example was the governor of Taiwan Province (臺灣省主席), Wu Kuo-chen (吳國楨). After the first critical article was published, Wu helped prevent the KMT from shutting down Free China. 91

89 Chang Chung-tung (張忠棟), “Lei Chen and Opposition Party (雷霆與反對黨)”, The Twisting Procedure of the Road for Taiwan being Democratic and Liberal (臺灣民主自由的曲折歷程), Taipei: Ch’eng She (澄社), 1992, pp. 66-69.

90 Yuan is an organizational unit in ROC’s government. It could be understood as an assembly or convention.

91 Ma Chih-shiao (馬之驊), Lei Chen and Chiang Kai-shek (雷霆與蔣介石), pp. 169-172.
Although the Free China Incident was a factional struggle between Hu Shih or Lei Chen and Chiang Ching-kuo, and because of the backgrounds of Hu and other members joining or associated with the Free China, Chiang Ching-kuo did not have enough political power to shut down the magazine.\textsuperscript{92} Lei Chen’s personal relationship with Chiang Kai-shek was generally believed, besides Hu Shih’s reputation, to be the most influential factor in slowing Chiang Ching-kuo’s dissolution of Free China.

The Personal Relationship Between Lei Chen and Chiang Kai-shek

Wang Shih-chieh was the bridge in Lei Chen’s relationship with Chiang Kai-shek. In the 1940s, Wang was the General Secretary of the “Political Participation Convention” \(\text{（國民參政會）}\)\textsuperscript{93} and the Chief of the Councilor Office of Military Committee \(\text{（軍事委員會）}\). In other words, Wang was Chiang’s intimate.\textsuperscript{94}

In 1927, Wang was nominated as the Chief of the “Legal System Bureau of Executive Yuan” \(\text{（行政院法制局）}\) when the KMT was still in mainland China. Simultaneously, Wang recruited Lei Chen as a member of its Editing and Screening Committee \(\text{（編審委員會）}\). Lei was further promoted to chief of the General Affairs Department when Wang was nominated as Minister of Education in 1933. In 1938,

\textsuperscript{92} Hu Fo, interview, 22nd Aug., 1995.

\textsuperscript{93} At that time, the ROC’s Constitution was not regulated. The Political Participation Convention could be regarded as the forerunner of National Assembly.

\textsuperscript{94} Ma Chih-shiao (馬之驥), \textit{Lei Chen and Chiang Kai-shek} \(\text{（雷震與蔣介石）}\), p. 9.
when the “Political Participation Convention” was established and Wang was nominated as its general secretary, Lei was also recruited to work in the Convention. Thereafter, owing to Wang’s recommendation, Lei Chen began making contact with Chiang Kai-shek. After being introduced to Chiang, Lei soon won the trust of Chiang Kai-shek. “In all committees of the Convention, as long as Chiang was the chief, Lei was always nominated as Chiang’s secretary. In all united organizations among parties, as long as Chiang was the leader, Lei was also Chiang’s secretary.”95 After the KMT withdrew to Taiwan, Chiang nominated Lei as a councilor of the Presidential Office in 1950. In 1951, as the representative of Chiang, Lei visited anti-communism leaders who had been exiled to Hongkong.96 And so, by the late 1940s, Chiang and Lei were close associates.

Although most of those working for Free China recognized that establishing an opposition party was the only path to democracy, few of them actually worked towards establishing the Chinese Democratic Party. Establishing an opposition party was originally Hu Shih’s brainchild.97 However, when Lei Chen invited Hu, the president of Academia Sinica, to be the chief of the new opposition party, Hu refused.98 Lei Chen then asked T’ao Pai-ch’uan (陶百川), a member of Control Yuan,

95 Ibid., p. 12.

96 Ibid., pp.34-49.

97 Hu Fo, interview, 22nd Aug., 1995.

to join the opposition party, but T’ao simply expressed that it was “inconvenient.”

Lei’s other old friends were either executive officers or legislators in the KMT’s government. Since all of these members had occupied political posts within the KMT’s government, it would be difficult for them to give up their current posts to seek uncertain and dangerous opportunities in reallocating political power. By contrast, the local Taiwanese elites were far from the center of power. Since KMT mainlanders monopolized the national elected posts, their only chance of persuading the KMT to ease its grip on power would be to organize an opposition party through the KMT-approved Free China as an organizational base.

There is also a security consideration for the Taiwanese leaders when joining Free China. During the 228 incident, thousands of Taiwanese elites were massacred. This bloody incident undoubtedly helped consolidate the authoritarian rule of KMT. Thus, the safest way for the surviving Taiwanese elites to ask the KMT to release its power was to operate under the protection of the KMT-run Free China. Clearly, the endurance of Free China after a few “article emergencies” granted the

---

99 Ibid., p.68.

100 Li Shiao-feng (李筱峰), The Taiwanese Delegates during the Early Period of Post-War (臺灣戰後初期的民意代表), Taipei: Tzu-Li Evening Post (自立晚報), 1993b, p. 216.

101 Article emergencies mean the crises for the KMT deciding to close Free China, when KMT felt its authority was directly challenged by Free China’s articles (e.g. “The government should not induce people to commit crimes.”, “Saving the
Taiwanese elites confidence that Free China could offer sufficient protection for them when engaging in the struggle of power reallocation. Under this consideration, the local Taiwanese elites began replacing mainlander members by the end of Free China period, and had gradually become the mainstream within this group, especially while establishing the Chinese Democratic Party (中國民主黨: CDP).  

On September 4, 1960, the Free China's democratic movement and the attempted establishment of the CDP were crushed when Free China was closed and its primary leader Lei Chen was arrested by KMT. During the 1960s, although some local elites like Kuo Yu-hsin (郭雨新) and Kuo Kuo-chi (郭國基) were still attacking the KMT government through local electoral channels, these individual activities, most of them were small and isolated, could not turn into a collective democratic movement. This stalemate of the democratic movement was a result of the failure of Free China. Precisely speaking, there was no group that could offer sufficient political protection like Free China did in the 1950s. Unless there was an organization that could cause Chiangs to hesitate, or was fostered directly by Chiangs, there was no single person or group that dare to sacrifice his/its political career by advocating...
democracy. The collapse of Free China also represented the withdrawal of the old
generation elites, especially the mainlanders, from the power struggle. After 1960, the
Free China figures like Wang Shih-chieh, Hu Shih, Hsia Tao-p’ing, and Mao Tzu-
shui did not continue to advocate democracy as Free China had done in the 1950s.

The University Incident

Although the magazine The University was founded in 1968, it did not
stimulate democratic reformation until 1970 when it was taken over and reorganized
by some post-war intellectuals. The rise of The University was significant for two
reasons:

1. A shield (the KMT-sponsored The University) was found to protect the
   opposition’s democratic views.

2. New political elites were about to emerge on the political stage.

There were two significant events which related to the rise of The University
during the 1970s. One was Chiang Ching-kuo’s succession; and the other was the
Republic of China’s expulsion from the United Nations.

In 1970, the KMT Central Party Bureau (中央黨部), in order to gain support
from intellectuals for Chiang’s succession, held two meetings to which many young
intellectuals were invited to debate current politics. After these two meetings, most of
these youths joined The University magazine and reorganized it into a critical
periodical. By January 1971, right after The University was reorganized, it published
an article entitled “A Letter to Chiang Ching-kuo” (給蔣經國的一封信). In this
article, the main issues focused on attacking Chiang’s intelligence organizations, and offered three suggestions to Chiang: 104

1. Listening to persons who “speak the truth”.

2. Providing a place for speaking the truth.

3. Allowing an opportunity for explanation, if one was hindered by the “security record” (specifically, the “loyalty record”) 105 when working or going abroad.

In October, 1971, The University published an article called “On National Affairs” (國是論言) This article, 106 aiming at civil rights, economy, the legal system, and the legislature, proposed collective demands on political reform. Simultaneously, the chief of The University, Ch’en Shao-t’ing (陳少廷), also wrote “The Question of Reelecting the National Representatives” (中央民代改選問題) and severely challenged the KMT’s legitimacy.

Beginning in the 1970s, United States president Richard Nixon began his

104 Ibid., p.172.

105 Security Record or Loyalty Record (安全記錄 or 忠誠記錄): conducted by secret agents of Chiang’s intelligence organization, prevailing in public organizations and campuses.

106 The “On National Affairs” is summarized as follows:

1. Renovation of the ruling elites: demanded the protection of human rights.

2. Adjustments of economic policies: restricted the budget of national defense, diplomacy, and government-run businesses.

3. Independence of the legal system: demanded the KMT to withdraw from the legal institutions.

4. Reconstruction of the legislative process: demanded the KMT to open the political participation channels, and to build a politically competitive society.
rapprochement towards China and desire to see Taiwan expelled from the U.N. created grave doubts within the KMT leadership about U.S. support of their regime. This, in turn, made the KMT, for the time being, willing to allow more political opposition.

In 1971, the ROC’s withdrawal from the United Nations sent a shockwave through Taiwan. In January 1972, response to this national crisis, a more striking article, “On Nine issues of National Affairs” (國是九論), was published by The University to demand reforms in the entire political system. These nine issues included (1) civil rights, (2) personnel and the system, (3) survival and diplomacy, (4) the direction of economic development, (5) agriculture and the peasant, (6) social welfare, (7) educational reform, (8) local politics, and (9) youth and politics. Due to the professional backgrounds of The University’s editors (Most of them were teachers in college), The University’s demands influenced college students. Numerous committees and debates on democracy were held on campus, especially in the National Taiwan University (NTU).107

Although The University was regarded as merely an instrument of Chiang Ching-kuo’s ascent to power, and to avoid the diplomatic crises during the early 1970s, the emergence of new political elites fostered by The University, as an unintended outcome, was still an important event concerning Taiwan’s political future.

107 Li Shiao-feng (李筱峰), In and Out Of History (進出歷史), p. 175.
The post-war generations of Taiwanese politics stepped into the prime of their lives during the period of The University. In contrast to the editorial group of Free China, most of these post-war generation editors at The University obtained higher education and were mostly majoring in the field of social science. Also many more were ethnic Taiwanese. A general background of these new post-war generation activists is included in Table 2.

Table 2

Main Editors of The University Magazine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>P.O.*</th>
<th>Age(1972)</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Backgrounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ch'en Shao-ting</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>MA, Political Science, NTU</td>
<td>Researcher, Columbia U.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang Kuo-shu</td>
<td>Shantung</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Ph.D., Psychology, U. of Illinois</td>
<td>Associate Professor, NTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'iu Hung-ta</td>
<td>Fuchien</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Ph.D., Law, Harvard University</td>
<td>Professor, Chengchih U. Chang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chun-hung</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>MA., Political Science, NTU.</td>
<td>4th Group, KMT Central Party President, WanCh'un</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Shao-wen</td>
<td>Fuchien</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Economics, NTU.</td>
<td>Commercial; General Secretary, Association of Young Businessmen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsu Hsin-liang</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Political Science, NTU.</td>
<td>1st Group, KMT Central Party Lecturer, NTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'en Ku-ing</td>
<td>Fuchien</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>MA., Philosophy, NTU.</td>
<td>1st Group, KMT Central Party Vice Professor, Tangchiang U., Manager, insurance company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pao Yi-hung</td>
<td>Szuch'uan</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>MA., History, Chinese Culture U.</td>
<td>Associate Professor, NTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kao Chih-liang</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Economics, NTU.</td>
<td>Professor, Chengchih U.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Wen-hsing</td>
<td>Fuchien</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>MA., University of Iowa</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Chengchih University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu Ch'un-fu</td>
<td>Hunan</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Ph.D., U. of Southern Illinois</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Chengchih University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin Shen-pao</td>
<td>Chianghsi</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>MA., Chengchih University</td>
<td>Lecturer, NTU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin Cheng-hung</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Law, NTU.</td>
<td>Associate Professor, NTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin Chung-hsiung</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>MA., Economics, NTU.</td>
<td>Associate Professor, NTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Jun-shu</td>
<td>Honan</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>MA., Political Science, Ohio U.</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Chengchih University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kao Chun</td>
<td>Chiangsu</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>MA., Political Science, Chinese Culture University</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Chinese Culture University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu Ta-chung</td>
<td>Chiangsu</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Political Science, Tunghai U.</td>
<td>Manager, Taiwan IBM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin Pao-shih</td>
<td>Kuangtung</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>History, National Taiwan</td>
<td>Committee of Party History, KMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Shang-te</td>
<td>Hunan</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>MA., Philosophy, NTU.</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Chinese Culture University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2 – Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>P.O.</th>
<th>Age (1972)</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Backgrounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hou Jung-mei</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Agricultural Economics, NTU.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch’ en Ying-chieh</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Foreign Language, Tangchiang U.</td>
<td>Chairman, Association of Young Businessmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch’ en Ta-hung</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Junior College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch’ en Han-ch’ing</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>MA., Political Science, U. of Minnesota</td>
<td>Lecturer, NTU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Hsia-yu</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Public Administration, National</td>
<td>NIA Chairman, Association of Young Businessmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chunghsing University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teng Wei-chen</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Psychology, NTU</td>
<td>Editor, magazines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu Fu-tseng</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>MA., NTU</td>
<td>Associate Professor, NTU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch’ en Te-yang</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Political Science, NTU.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Chen</td>
<td>Shantung</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Ph.D., economics, U. of Oklahoma</td>
<td>Professor, NTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su Chun-hsiung</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ph.D., Law, German.</td>
<td>Associate Professor, NTU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan Ch’un-po</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>International Affairs, Harvard U.</td>
<td>1st Group, KMT Central Party</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P.O. : Provincial Origins.

Source: Li Shao-feng (李筱峰), In and Out Of History (進出歷史), Taiwan, Tao-hsiang Press (稻香出版社), 1992, p. 194.

Just as the Free China incident was a victory for Chiang Ching-kuo in consolidating his power, the decline of The University further strengthen his hand.\(^{108}\)

After the Incident in the Philosophy Department of NTU,\(^{109}\) the University began to decline. According to Chang Shao-wen, “after the reorganization, the political attitudes of The University members were very complex. This is also an

\(^{108}\) Hu Fo, interview, 22nd Aug., 1995.

\(^{109}\) The Incident of Philosophy Department of NTU (臺大哲學系事件): see also Chapter Two. This incident was regarded as an implication that The University was targeted by the KMT for a possible political purge in the near future, and also the key event which threatening the editorial group of The University for continuously challenging KMT’s authority.
important cause of The University's decline. According to Chang Chun-hung (張俊宏: an editor of The University, and later a leader of TangWai opposition group), two politically charged circumstances also caused the decline of The University. First, the unstable period, Taiwan’s withdrawal from the United Nations in 1971, had passed. Second, the KMT’s power succession was accomplished after Chiang Ching-kuo became the prime minister in 1971. Due to these factors, the KMT authority recovered its power monopoly; Chiang Ching-kuo did not need the support of critic’s anymore. Yet another key reason for its decline, according to Hu Fo, was, once again, the intervention of Chiang’s secret agents. The popularity of The University led to Chiang’s concern that it would be difficult to control The University in the future. With this in mind, Chiang used his special agents to drive a wedge between the editors of The University. According to Hu Fo, Chiang first co-opted some mainlander intellectuals into the government and KMT party organizations to weaken the strength of The University. Secondly, he used the secret agents to threaten some of The University’s editors, and caused them to be suspicious of each other.

Regarding the reasons for The University’s decline mentioned above, even though the opposition was able to take advantage of the KMT’s initial strong support for the magazine, the development of the opposition was still uncertain. It was uncertain because it was not just the opposition “using” the KMT, the KMT, in return,  

---

110 Li Shiao-feng (李筱峰), In and Out Of History (進出歷史), p.176.  

111 Hu Fo, interview, 22nd Aug., 1995.
was also “using” the opposition. As long as the state guaranteed protection for the magazine and did not use violence, the opposition would be held responsible for quieting dissent among the people, especially from the campuses, in order to get Taiwan safely through the national crises such as the derecognition of the ROC’s international status and instability of Chiang Ching-kuo’s succession. Once the national crises had passed, the regime no longer felt it necessary to continue permitting the opposition to criticize or directly challenge its authority.

The victory of Chiang’s special agents caused the failure of The University. The closure of The University had taught the oppositionists the better lesson that involvement in KMT factional politics and dependence solely upon the KMT’s tolerance for dissent was an unreliable power base on which to establish an opposition. However, the prospects of The University’s members were still promising. Among its members, Chang Chun-hung (張俊宏) and Hsu Hsin-liang (許信良) later joined the local opposition after the decline of The University; and, thereafter, Taiwan’s opposition evolved through the TangWai period.
CHAPTER IV

THE OPPOSITION BREAKS THROUGH

After Taiwan’s political participation had been expanded to the national level by the “supplementary elections” in 1972, the electoral system received greater political consideration than ever before. Simultaneously, the TangWai began to receive the “continuous” political protection which came with being a serious electoral contender. This was crucial to its development. Before 1970, the protection mainly came from the KMT regime. This protection hinged on either the relationship between opposition leaders and the ruling elites, as with the Free China, or on the co-optation from the regime, as with The University. Unlike Free China and The University, the TangWai group used public offices, won in local and national elections, as its shield of protection. This was especially true during the 1977 elections when non-KMT partisans took two posts as county magistrates, two seats of mayor, 21 seats as provincial representatives, and 8 seats of Taipei city representatives. Through the 1970s elections the opposition power gradually


\[113\] Ibid., p. 188.
constructed a sort of semi-party, the TangWai group.

The transition to protection for the opposition had two important implications:

1. The emergence of mass demonstrations.

2. The indigenization of opposition power-- or the emergence of Taiwanese ideology.

The TangWai Period Before the Formosa Incident

As noted, the TangWai’s protective shield was mainly public posts created during elections in the 1970s. Unlike Free China and The University, which were begging the KMT for political reforms, the TangWai went out into the public and, building a mass base, directly challenged the KMT’s legitimacy. Public representatives, on either the local or national level, could guarantee effective protection for the opposition power. The Free China’s security mainly depended on the relationships between the KMT’s authority and members who were influential political figures, like Hu Shih and Lei Chen. By contrast, the TangWai moved in a different direction, utilizing public representatives with its support coming from the populace. Hence, mass demonstrations were often used by the TangWai candidates during elections, sometimes to protest electoral injustice. The most memorable example was the Chungli Incident (中壢事件).

---

114 “Semi-party” refers to a political group which functions collectively, though has not been legalized and well institutionalized.
After the decline of the University, Hsu Hsin-liang (許信良), an editor at The University, was co-opted and nominated by the KMT, and elected as a provincial representative in 1973. In 1977, Hsu published a book called The Sound of Wind and Rain (風雨之聲)\textsuperscript{115} to state important interpellations in the Provincial Assembly, and also to severely criticize his KMT colleagues during his four years as a provincial representative. The book was regarded as Hsu’s announcement of candidacy for Taoyuan Magistrate in 1977. Unfortunately, because of this book, the KMT rejected his nomination.\textsuperscript{116} After being rejected, Hsu withdrew from the KMT and joined the TangWai group to continue his campaign. On October 19th, the KMT was suspected of cheating in the election.\textsuperscript{117} Over ten thousand people gathered in front of Chungli police station to protest the controversy. After the Chungli Incident, Hsu was elected

\textsuperscript{115} Hsu Ts’e (徐策), The Leaders of Taiwan’s Future in the 1990s (九零年代臺灣前途主導人物), Taipei, Tien-Hsiang (天相) Press, 1989, pp. 133-134. In “The Sound of Wind and Rain”, Hsu divided his provincial representatives colleagues into four categories, (1) hereditary nobleman, (2) financial tycoon, (3) public officer, and (4) politician who places personal gain above public interests (世家,財閥,公務人員,政客), to make judgments and reveal corruption of his colleagues.

\textsuperscript{116} This book, of course, annoyed most of his KMT colleagues and was also regarded disobedient by the KMT. Thus, KMT rejected nominating Hsu as the candidate of Taoyuan county in 1977 was likely abvious.

\textsuperscript{117} Li Shiao-feng (李筱峰), The Taiwan’s Democratic Movements in Past Forty Years (臺灣民主運動四十年) 5th ed., pp. 124-25. This Incident broke out with an imitation voting ticket which was suspected, by Hsu’s supporters, made by KMT. When Hsu’s supporters were gathering to protest the unfairness of election, the police mishandled this situation with shooting. It caused that some of Hsu’s supporters were injured and dead, and finally led to a riot.
as the Taoyuan Magistrate; needless to say, influenced by this incident, the TangWai group began to use mass demonstrations.

At the same time, due to the different opinions about using mass demonstrations, two factions began to emerge within the TangWai group, the “Eighties” and “Formosa” factions (八十年代 & 美麗島). The “Eighties” faction, which was mainly composed of core members in The Eighties magazine, advocated a more moderate way of demanding Taiwan’s democratization. The Formosa faction, which was led by main editors of Formosa magazine, advocated radical mass demonstrations in challenging the KMT. Although these two factions embraced different strategies in dealing with the KMT, by the Formosa Incident, both factions assisted each other in every election and rarely struggled publicly.\(^{118}\)

There was a crucial factor to consider when gathering members to form the TangWai group. Most of the TangWai core members, except for Ch’en Ku-Ying, were Taiwanese. This meant that those associated with the opposition power were tightly associated with the Taiwanese provincial origin. Research on this phenomenon has found that many Mainlanders refused to join the TangWai group because of the language barrier.\(^{119}\) However, the most important reason why mainlanders did not join the TangWai group was that they could not obtain effective protection against the

\(^{118}\) Ibid., pp. 142-47.

\(^{119}\) Li Shiao-feng (李筱峰), In and Out Of History (進出歷史), p. 200.
KMT as Taiwanese oppositionists could during this period. As far as elections went, TangWai’s Taiwanese elites could use public posts as protection against the powerful and threatening KMT. Meanwhile, mainlander oppositionists lacked public support. Unless they obtained strong loyal support from the Taiwanese public representatives, joining the TangWai group would easily jeopardize their attempt to confront KMT’s political abuse. Table 3 will offer a general idea about how the TangWai group was organized in the 1970s.

Table 3

TangWai Members Before the Formosa Incident

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>P.O.*</th>
<th>Age (1979)</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Backgrounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Huang Hsin-chieh</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Administration, Chunghsing U.</td>
<td>Taipei Representative; Legislator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu Hsiu-lien</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>MA., University of Illinois &amp; Harvard University</td>
<td>Section Chief of Regulation Committee, Executive Yuan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang T’ien-fu</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Political Science, NTU.</td>
<td>National Representative lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yao Chia-wen</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Law, NTU.</td>
<td>lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin Yi-hsiung</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Law, NTU.</td>
<td>Army Officer; Journalist; being in political jail for years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shih Ming-te</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Military Academy</td>
<td>Provincial Representative; Magistrate, Taoyuan County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsu Hsin-liang</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Political Science, Chengchih U.</td>
<td>Editor, The University; General Editor, Taiwan Political Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Chun-hung</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>MA., Political Science, NTU.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to Taiwanese Sympathetic Consciousness mentioned in Chapter II, it would be hard for the Taiwanese to trust a mainlander oppositionist and to support him to obtain a public post in challenging KMT. During TangWai period, almost every public representative supported and elected by opposition group was Taiwanese.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>P.O.</th>
<th>Age (1979)</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Backgrounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chang Te-ming</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Law, NTU</td>
<td>lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang T'o</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>MA., Chinese, Chengchih U.</td>
<td>Teacher, High School Lecturer, College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'en Chu</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>junior college</td>
<td>Assistant, Provincial Representative Editor, TangWai magazines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'en Chung-hsin</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mathematics, Tunghai U.</td>
<td>Staff of Academia Sinica; was in jail for the P'eng Ming-min case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wei T'ing-ch’ao</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Law, NTU</td>
<td>Editor, TangWai magazines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Fu-chung</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>National Junior College of Art</td>
<td>journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'en Po-wen</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu Che-lang</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Pingtung Junior College of Agriculture</td>
<td>teacher; journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang Huang-hsiung</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>MA., Political Science, NTU.</td>
<td>Lecturer, college writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang Ch‘ing-ch’u</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>Lecturer, college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsieh San-sheng</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>MA., Public Administration, Chengchih University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsieh Hsiu-hsiung</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Doctor of Divinity</td>
<td>Professor, Tainan Seminary; priest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su Ch‘ing-li</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Philosophy, NTU.</td>
<td>General Editor, magazines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Ch‘un-nan</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Taichung Normal College</td>
<td>teacher; National Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch’iu Lien-hui</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Chunghsing University</td>
<td>County &amp; Provincial Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho Ch‘un-mu</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>Taichung &amp; Provincial Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang Shun-hsing</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>County Representative; Magistrate, Taitung County; Legislator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K‘ang Ning-hsiang</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Public Administration, Chunghsing University</td>
<td>Taipei Representative; Legislator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch‘en Wu-hsun</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>MA., Economics, Japan</td>
<td>Lecturer, college; manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kao Ling-hung</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>senior college</td>
<td>journalist; businessman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho Wen-chen</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Chinese Medical College</td>
<td>businessman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu Feng-sung</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Taichung Normal College</td>
<td>teacher; Staff, Taipei Local Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch‘en Ku-ying</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>MA., Philosophy, NTU.</td>
<td>Lecturer, NTU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang Yu-chiao</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Tokyo Medical University, Japan.</td>
<td>Editor, The University joined establishing the CDP; County and Provincial representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch‘en Wan-chen</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Journal, Taiwan Normal U.</td>
<td>Journalist, China Times.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 – Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>P.O.</th>
<th>Age(1979)</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Backgrounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shi Chih-fen</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Taipei Commercial High School manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin Hung-hsuan</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Philosophy, NTU. Editor; TangWai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi Wan-sheng</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Taichung Normal College teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chou P‘ing-te</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>primary school; had passed 7 National Examinations</td>
<td>businessman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch’iu Ch’ui-chen</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>junior college</td>
<td>amateur singer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ts’ai Yu-ch’uan</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Tainan Seminary</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch’iu Mao-nan</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Pingtung Commercial High.</td>
<td>County Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K’ang Shui-mu</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>Taipei Representative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P. O.: Provincial Origins

Source: Li Shao-feng (李筱峰), In and Out Of History (進出歷史), Taiwan, Tao-hsiang Press, 1992, pp. 199-200.

Provincial origin was reinforced as an integrator of the opposition after the decline of The University. After the decline of The University, most mainland editors were co-opted by the KMT and entered the party organization or central government. By contrast, those members who joined the TangWai group were almost all Taiwanese. For the Taiwanese, the 228 Incident and the history of KMT’s monopolization of Taiwan’s political system caused them to distrust the authority. Although the Taiwanization Policy$^{121}$ was advocated by Chiang’s mainland regime, the fact that power did not derive from the votes of citizens still made the Taiwanese...
feel that their power was not strong enough to challenge KMT. As long as Taiwanese elites obtained the mass bases, the KMT, desiring stability, would be hesitant to suppress or arrest activists as they had done in the 228 Incident and the Free China case.

However, the chances for the TangWai group to gain its voting bases were temporarily diminished by Chiang Ching-kuo’s “emergent order”\(^{122}\) when the ROC broke diplomatic relations with the USA in December 1978.\(^{123}\) Lacking an electoral platform for political criticism, the TangWai began to use demonstrations to build its mass base in 1979. This led to the Ch’iao T’ou Incident (橋頭事件) in January,\(^{124}\) and later the Formosa Incident in December.

\(^{122}\) Chiang Kai-shek died in 1975, and his son, Chiang Ching-kuo, succeeded the presidency of ROC in 1977.

\(^{123}\) The “Supplementary Elections” were held again in December 1978. When president Carter announced to established diplomatic relationship with the PRC on December 16, Chiang immediately declared to temporarily terminated these “Supplementary Elections”. Until December 1980, these elections were re-held.

\(^{124}\) On Jan. 1979, TangWai leader Yu Teng-fa (余登發) was under arrest and accused of “attempted rebellion”. TangWai leaders and thousands of supporters gathered in Ch’iao T’ou to protest the KMT’s illegal arrest. This Incident was regarded as an alarm of that the KMT was going to use intelligence force during the national crisis. After this incident, Hsu Shin-liang, the Magistrate of Taoyuan County, was impeached by the Control Yuan, because of his joining of this protest. In order not to be a next victim, Hsu exiled to the USA, and did not return to Taiwan until 1989.
The Formosa Incident

After the TangWai’s electoral victories in 1977, Formosa magazine began its publication in 1979, with most of the TangWai leaders joining the journal as co-founders. The Formosa headquarters served as a front organization for opposition politicians, and its local distribution offices as branches of the organization. The opposition leaders used the journal and its distribution network as cover for holding several rallies to challenge Martial Law. The KMT became alarmed when Formosa started to gather momentum.

On December 10th, 1979, the Formosa group held a convention in Kaohsiung City to commemorate the United Nations’ “International Human Rights Day” (國際人權日). Tens of thousands of people were gathered by the Formosa group to parade after the convention. The stressful atmosphere was intensified when the police deployed their riot squad. After the police blockaded the road and fired tear gas grenades, the parade participants clashed with the police. The police put down the uprising. This episode, the largest conflict between citizens and police since the 228 Incident, is known as the Formosa Incident. After the Incident, the KMT quickly arrested many important members of the Formosa group and closed down Formosa magazine and its branches. A total of 45 persons were arrested after the Formosa Incident. Eight Formosa core members\textsuperscript{125} were accused of rebellion and adjudged in

\textsuperscript{125} These members include Huang Hsin-chieh, Shih Ming-te, Yao Chia-wen, Ch’en Chu, Lu Hsiu-lian, Chang Chun-hung, Lin Hung-hsuan, and Lin Yi-hsiung (黃信介,
the Military Court (軍事法庭).

In order to maintain its open image, the KMT did not forbid the press from reporting the trial. During the trial, all defendants focused their arguments on the large, more controversial issues of “rebellion” and “Taiwan’s Independence”, not the narrow issue of conflict between the people and the police. This extended the mass media coverage and forced observers to seriously consider these long-suppressed political problems.

The TangWai Period After the Formosa Incident -- The Formosa’s Legacy and TangWai’s Prosperity

By altering its method of challenging the KMT to compete for public offices, the opposition demonstrated its desire to retain its rebellious reputation after the Formosa Incident. Unlike Free China and The University, TangWai’s political power was increasingly rooted in the masses of Taiwanese population, and no longer in its relationship with the KMT regime. The ultimate change in the TangWai was caused by the factional conflicts between moderate and radical TangWai members. After the Formosa Incident, The “Eighties” faction leader K’ang Ning-hsiang was regarded as the leader of the TangWai group. The radical new TangWai generations, who were dissatisfied with K’ang’s moderate leadership style and wanted to take over the vacancies left by the Formosa members, began to attack K’ang severely for being too

施明德, 姚嘉文, 陳菊, 呂秀蓮, 張俊宏, 林弘宣, 林義雄).
weak in the Legislative Yuan. This factional struggle gave the new radical TangWai generations the chance to become the TangWai main stream, and also highlighted mass demonstrations in facing KMT’s future political purges.

Although many TangWai members were jailed after the Formosa Incident, their political power was not eliminated by their absence. The imprisonment of the Formosa leaders, in turn, spawned two “family lines” of new and radical oppositionists. One was the relatives of the Formosa victims, the other was the victims’ attorney group.

This inheritance of public opposition power began in 1980, two years after the Formosa Incident, when the KMT re-held the national elections which were terminated by the 1979 US-PRC recognition crisis. In these elections, the relatives and attorneys of the jailed Formosa leaders ran the campaigns and were elected by very high margins. The following is a list of victims’ relatives and attorneys who took over the opposition positions left open by the Formosa members:

**Legislators:**
- Huang Tien-fu (黃天福): Huang Hsin-chieh’s brother.
- Hsu Jung-shu (許榮淑): Chang Chun-hung’s wife.
- Chang Te-ming (張德銘): attorney

**National Representatives:**
- Chou Ching-yu (周清玉): Yao Chia-wen’s wife

---

126 Li Shiao-feng (李筱峰), *The Taiwan’s Democratic Movements in Past Forty Years* (臺灣民主運動四十年) 5th ed., pp.184-88. K’ang was thought, by the radical TangWai new generations, too moderate to deal with the KMT in many budget cases in the Legislative Yuan during the late 1970s.

127 Ibid., pp.163-171.
member of the Control Yuan:
Yu Ch’ing (尤清): attorney

Moreover, Huang Huang-hsiung (黃煌雄), a TangWai member, inherited Lin Yi-hsiung’s (林義雄) constituency and was elected as a legislator in Yilan (宜蘭) County.

The election of 1980 did inspire the Formosa victims’ relatives and attorneys to involve themselves in later elections. In the local elections of 1981, Su Chen-ch’ang (蘇貞昌), a lawyer in the attorney group, was elected as provincial representative. Two other lawyers, Hsieh Ch’ang-t’ing (謝長廷) and Chen Shui-pien (陳水扁), were simultaneously elected as Taipei representatives. Furthermore, two of the TangWai’s newest members, Yu Hsi-k’un (遊錫堃) and Lin Cheng-chieh (林正杰), were also elected as provincial representatives and Taipei representatives.128

Table 4 underscores the occupational backgrounds of the TangWai leaders after the Formosa Incident.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>P.O.*</th>
<th>Age (1986)</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Backgrounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fei Hsi-p’ing</td>
<td>Liaoning</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Political Science, Beijing U.</td>
<td>Legislator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yu Ch’ing</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Ph.D., Law, Hydeburge U., Germany</td>
<td>Lawyer member of Control Yuan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

128 Li Shiao-feng (李筱峰), _In and Out Of History_ (進出歷史), pp. 182-183.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>P.O.</th>
<th>Age(1986)</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Backgrounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lin Cheng-shieh</td>
<td>Fuchien</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>MA., Public Administration, Chengchih U.</td>
<td>Taipei Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsieh Ch’ang-t’ing</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Law, NTU.</td>
<td>lawyer, Taipei Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chou Ch’ing-yu</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Sociology, NTU.</td>
<td>National Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Chun-hsiung</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Law, NTU.</td>
<td>lawyer, Legislator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ts’ai Chieh-hsiung</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Chunghsing University</td>
<td>Provincial Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang T’ien-fu</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Political Science, NTU.</td>
<td>National Representative, Legislator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang Yu-chiao</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Tokyo Medical University, Japan.</td>
<td>Provincial Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin Wen-lang</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Taipei Commercial High.</td>
<td>Taipei Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch’en Chin-te</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Taipei Tech. Junior College</td>
<td>Provincial Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kao Hsing-hsiung</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Law, NTU.</td>
<td>hotel manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsu Jung-shu</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>National Taiwan Normal U.</td>
<td>teacher; Legislator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yu Ch’en Yueh-ying</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>University, Japan.</td>
<td>Provincial Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Chao-ch’uan</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Architecture, NTU.</td>
<td>Legislator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su Chen-ch’ang</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Law, NTU.</td>
<td>lawyer; Provincial Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K’ang Shui-mu</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>Taipei Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yu Hsi-k’un</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Political Science, Tunghai U.</td>
<td>Provincial Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chou Pu-lun</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Law, Tunghwa University</td>
<td>lawyer assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang P’eng-chien</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>MA., Law, NTU.</td>
<td>lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Te-ming</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Law, NTU.</td>
<td>lawyer, Legislator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch’en Shui-pien</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Law, NTU.</td>
<td>lawyer; Taipei Representative; Legislator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yen Chin-fu</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Law, NTU.</td>
<td>teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K’ang Ning-hsiang</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Public Administration, Chunghsing U.</td>
<td>Taipei Representative; Legislator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Yi-hsiung</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Ph.D., Paris University, France.</td>
<td>lawyer; professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chu Kao-cheng</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Ph.D., Bonn University, Germany</td>
<td>professor; Legislator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch’iu Lien-hui</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Chunghsing University</td>
<td>Provincial Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chou Ts’ang-yuan</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>Provincial Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shih Hsing-jung</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Kaohsiung Medical College</td>
<td>doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yu Ling-ya</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>History, Chengchih U.</td>
<td>Provincial Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsieh San-sheng</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>MA., Public Administration, Chengchih University.</td>
<td>Provincial Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin Cho-shui</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Asian Language, Chengchih University</td>
<td>high school teacher; Editor, TangWai magazine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Fu-chung</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>National Art Junior College</td>
<td>Editor, TangWai magazine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hung Ch’i-ch’ang</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Master, Medical U. of Toronto, Canada</td>
<td>doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lui Chou-ch’eng</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Ph.D. candidate, Philosophy</td>
<td>Editor, TangWai magazines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu Nai-jen</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Economics, Tunghai U.</td>
<td>Editor, TangWai magazines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 – Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>P.O.</th>
<th>Age(1986)</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Backgrounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ch’iu Yi-jen</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Philosophy, NTU.</td>
<td>Editor, TangWai magazines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U. of Chicago (incomplete)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang Chao-k’ai</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>National Art Junior College</td>
<td>businessman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li Sheng-hsiung</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>MA., U. of Illinois</td>
<td>lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan Yuan-lu</td>
<td>Chekiang</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>MA., American Affairs, Tunghai University.</td>
<td>Editor, TangWai magazines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>assistant of TangWai public representatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P.O.: Provincial Origin.

Source: Li Shao-feng (李筱峰), *In and Out Of History* (進出歷史), Taiwan, Tao-hsiang Press, 1992, p. 204.

The consequences of the 1981 elections further accelerated the rise of the TangWai’s new generations. More and more the TangWai’s new generations sought elected office and won, especially during the elections of 1984 and 1985. The more TangWai members were elected as public representatives, the harder the KMT worked to destroy TangWai’s base and reconsolidate its authoritarian control.

Institutionalization of Opposition Power

Although the TangWai had been regarded as an opposition group in the early 1970s, the TangWai members often challenged the KMT as individuals. In spite of close, informal personal relations among these members, there was no formal organization built for unifying these individual powers.

The first consolidation, led by K’ang Ning-hsiang and Huang Hsin-chieh (康
Although the TangWai was successful in this election, a formally organized structure that could act as an opposition party had not yet emerged. A visible and formal TangWai organization was not formed until 1979. After the Formosa magazine was initially published in August, 1979, the TangWai members began to mobilize the local branches of the Formosa Monthly Association. However, due to the cancellation of the elections, and the Formosa Incident in 1979, it was doubtful that the Formosa group could operate successfully.

In the local elections of 1981, TangWai began to act as an organized group. During these elections, the opposition power initiated the “TangWai Recommendation Corps” to operate a nomination committee as a formal party to recommend TangWai candidates for elections. After the election of 1981, the opposition power continued to nominate candidates in every election under the label of TangWai.

In 1983, TangWai group established the “TangWai Central Campaign Assistance Committee” (黨外中央選舉後援會). In this organization, the TangWai’s new generations tried to add provisions which insisted that TangWai candidates must win in a primary election before running a campaign for public office. However, these provisions were not approved by the TangWai members. Under this situation, the new radical TangWai generations established the “TangWai Association of Magazine Editors and Writers” (黨外編輯作家聯誼會). It was the first formal and legal
association of the TangWai group.

In 1984, a more crucial organization, the “TangWai Association for Public Policy Study” (黨外公共政策研究會), was established by TangWai members who were, or had been, public representatives. In March, the Association for Public Policy Study began to establish local branches. This movement created tension between the KMT and TangWai. On May 10th, a meeting was held by four scholars, T’ao Pai-ch’uan (陶百川), Hu Fo (胡佛), Yang Kuo-shu (楊國樞), and Li Hung-hsi (李鴻禧),\(^{129}\) to mediate between the KMT and TangWai. However, in spite of the mediation, Yen Chin-fu and Ch’en Shui-pien, two Taipei representatives, established the “Taipei Branch” (台北分部) on the same day. One week later, K’ang Ning-hsiang established the “Capital Branch” (首都分部). After the two branches were established, the other branches soon emerged in Taiwan’s major cities.\(^ {130}\) In early July, “TangWai Association for Public Policy Study” secretly organized a “Regulating Group for Establishing a New Party” (組黨行動規畫小組) and soon associated with the “TangWai Association of Magazine Editors and Writers” to organize a new party. This group was generally regarded as the inspiration for the establishment of the

\(^{129}\) T’ao was a political advisor of president office (總統府資政). Hu, Yang, and Li were professors of NTU. These persons obtain high reputations in Taiwan and were regarded as liberalists.

\(^{130}\) Li Shiao-feng (李筱峰), In and Out Of History (進出歷史), pp. 184-185.
Democratic Progressive Party (DPP).\textsuperscript{131}

Along with the growth and institutionalization of the opposition, instability within the KMT at this time left more and more “space” for the TangWai group to grow. As in the case of The University, the KMT’s succession problems created another “democratic vacation” (民主假期)\textsuperscript{132} for the opposition.

The Decline of KMT Hard-Liners and Chiang’s Determination to Pursue Democratization

As mentioned, after the TangWai’s electoral victory in 1977, Chiang Ching-kuo removed co-optationist leader Li Huan, who was carrying out Chiang’s Taiwanization Policy, and increased the power of the hard-liner leader Wang Sheng. However, the mishandling of several intelligence operations such as the Formosa Incident, the murder of the mother and twin daughters of Formosa victim Lin Yehsiung, the Chen Wen-cheng case, all gradually destroyed the KMT hard-liners’ credibility with Chiang Ching-kuo, and simultaneously eroded the KMT’s “repression option” toward the opposition.

\textsuperscript{131} Li Shiao-feng (李筱峰), The Taiwan’s Democratic Movements in Past Forty Years (台灣民主運動四十年) 5th ed., pp. 222-232.

\textsuperscript{132} Democratic Vacation (民主假期): a political term in Taiwan, means a period that the authority, under certain considerations such as keeping stability along succession and maintaining democratic images during elections, hesitates to use suppressive force to handle activities of the opposition power. This situation removes the limits on democratic movements, looks like a “vacation”.
During the Formosa Military trial, on February 28, 1980, the mother and twin daughters of Formosa victim Lin Yi-hsiung were murdered. On July 3, 1981, a Taiwanese-American professor Chen Wen-cheng was mysteriously found dead on the NTU campus after a lengthy interrogation by the Taiwan Garrison Headquarters. These two cases, which are now universally believed to be political murders committed by Wang Sheng’s secret agents, severely worsened U.S.-ROC relations. These cases also led Chiang to remove Wang Sheng and return co-optationist leader Li Huan to power. Later, yet another mishandled intelligence operation, the Chiang Nan Incident, still further discredited the KMT hard-liners and strengthened Chiang’s determination to pursue democracy.

Chiang Nan is a pseudonym for Liu Yi-Liang (劉宜良). He was better known to westerners by his English name, “Henry Liu”. In 1950, Chiang Nan studied at the Political Work Cadre’s School under the Ministry of National Defense, and was trained to be a political staff officer in the army; in essence, another agent of Chiang’s. In 1954, on the eve of graduation, he left the Political Staff College and enrolled in the Department of English of the National Taiwan Normal University (臺灣師範大學: NTNU). After graduation, Chiang Nan went to the Taiwan Daily (臺灣時報) as a reporter, and was sent to the USA in 1967. In 1984, Chiang Nan published

133 Wang was removed to be the ambassador in Paraguay in September 1983. Li Huan, then, was promoted to be the Minister of Education in 1984, member of the KMT Central Standing Committee in 1986, and the KMT General Secretary in 1987.
The Biography of Chiang Ching-kuo, which revealed some unknown secrets of the Chiang’s family, such as how Chiang Ching-kuo used secret agents to eliminate his political opponents and the corruption within Chiang’s family. After The Biography of Chiang Ching-kuo was published, Chiang Nan was soon murdered in front of his own house in San Francisco in October 1984.\textsuperscript{134}

Chiang Nan’s death was also suspected to be a political murder. U.S. authorities determined that Ch’eng Ch’i-li (陳啟禮) and Wu Tun (吳敦) of “The Bamboo Gang” (竹聯幫), Taiwan’s biggest criminal gang organization, were Chiang Nan’s murderers. In early 1985, it was revealed that Wang Hsi-ling (汪希翎), chief of the Defense Ministry’s Central Intelligence Bureau (國防部中央情報局), had ordered the murder.\textsuperscript{135} Wang’s punishment for Chiang Nan’s murder proved dramatically that KMT hard-liners and their secret agencies could no longer expect to avoid responsibility for such activities. Ultimately, the incident also tarnished the reputation of the man who oversaw these spy operations: Chiang’s second son, Chiang Shiao-wu.

By the early 1980s, president Chiang Ching-kuo’s increasing physical problems, including his diabetes, accelerated the need for new leadership. Based on Chiang’s dominance in KMT intelligence organizations in the early 1970s when he

\textsuperscript{134} Masatake Wakabayashi (若林正丈), Democratization in a Divided Country (臺灣：分裂國家與民主化), p. 207.

\textsuperscript{135} Ibid.
was succeeding his father Chiang Kai-shek, some scholars believe that, in order to maintain political stability, Chiang Ching-kuo originally wanted to select a successor with an intelligence background. However, due to the KMT hard-liners' decline, none of Chiang's intimates in the security field was powerful enough to both succeed him and maintain Taiwan's political stability. Chiang responded by nominating Li Huan as KMT General Secretary in 1987. Li Huan's historic power in the KMT party organization suggests that Chiang might have been trying to set Li up to assist (or perhaps, eventually replace) Chiang's Taiwanese Vice President Lee Teng-hui after Chiang's death and Lee's succession to the presidency. Chiang nominated Lee Teng-hui, an educated Taiwanese, but without an independent power base of his own, as Vice President in 1984, largely for reasons of provincial origins. Even though Lee, as the Vice President, would succeed to the presidency after Chiang's death, many analysts at the time believed that Lee would only be a

---


137 Chiang's intimates who had intelligence backgrounds in the early 1980s were Wang Sheng and Chiang's second son Chiang Shiao-wu. As mentioned, Wang lost his power after 1983 and Chiang Shiao-wu was also implicated in the Chiang Nan murder in 1984 and was soon removed from intelligence organizations.


139 Li Sung-lin (李松林), Chiang Ching-kuo and Taiwan.(蔣經國的臺灣時代), Taipei: Feng-yun Time (風雲時代), 1993, pp.143-149.
"temporary successor" because he lacked a strong support base among the KMT leaders.\textsuperscript{140} The complex political struggle within the KMT which ensued after Chiang’s death, however, rapidly strengthened Lee’s support group, and led to his consolidation of power as President and KMT party chief.\textsuperscript{141}

Chiang’s Final Policy and the Establishment of the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP)

Although Chiang arranged for liberal-minded figures such as Lee Teng-hui and Li Huan to succeed to power, these arrangements alone could not effectively guarantee stability after his death. Chiang also tried to arrange ways to regulate the TangWai’s power in a political system.\textsuperscript{142} His last major policy initiative, proposing the “Political Renovation” in 1986, revealed his determination to regulate the TangWai’s emergence and growth within the political system.

The decline of the KMT hard-liners in the early 1980s and Chiang’s “Political Renovation” after 1986 removed the largest obstacles to the TangWai’s establishment

\textsuperscript{140} Masatake Wakabayashi (若林正丈), \textit{Democratization in a Divided Country} (臺灣：分裂國家與民主化), p. 229.

\textsuperscript{141} About KMT’s political struggle see also Masatake Wakabayashi (若林正丈), \textit{Democratization in a Divided Country} (臺灣：分裂國家與民主化), pp. 231-234., and Li Sung-lin (李松林), \textit{Chiang Ching-kuo and Taiwan} (蔣經國的臺灣時代), Taipei: Feng-yun Time (風雲時代), 1993, pp. 250-253.

\textsuperscript{142} Masatake Wakabayashi (若林正丈), \textit{Democratization in a Divided Country} (臺灣：分裂國家與民主化), pp. 206-209.
of the DPP. On September 28th, 1986, the TangWai held a convention at the Grand Hotel in Taipei to nominate candidates for the national election. Although the purpose of this convention ostensibly was nomination, it has been reported that the TangWai leadership originally tried to use this nomination convention to establish a new party.

Some evidences reveal an attempt by the TangWai to construct a new party as soon as possible. As mentioned, the TangWai group had already organized a “Regulating Group for Establishing a New Party” in early July of 1986. On September 17th, TangWai also held a meeting to discuss the details of the new party’s establishment. At this meeting, a group was organized to discuss the name and guidelines of the new party. TangWai members who joined this meeting even signed as founders of the new party. In order to promote the new party’s name in the elections of 1986, the TangWai leaders held a meeting on September 27th to draft a proposal that would establish a new party, and operated the “TangWai Association of Electoral Assistance” to schedule this proposal into the convention on September 28th. Two factors seem to have raised the TangWai’s enthusiasm and feeling that conditions were favorable for establishing a new party.

1. In the KMT:

After the removal of Wang Sheng and Chiang Shiao-wu, Chiang Ching-kuo’s Political Renovation had shown his determination to regulate the opposition power within the political system. His determination reflected the possibility that the TangWai could become a legalized political party. As a result of Chiang Ching-kuo’s
Political Renovation, the KMT was at its weakest level of power since Chiang took over power in 1971. Consequently, the TangWai saw a window of opportunity.

Although Chiang chose the option of collective succession, this device could not guarantee the continuity of Chiang’s Political Renovation after Chiang’s death. Due to the uncertainty of his successors’ ability, strength, and personalities, the best time for the TangWai to seize the opportunities for establishing a new party was before Chiang’s death. Since Chiang was dying, a new party should be established as soon as possible.

2. In the TangWai group:

The main concern of the TangWai itself was still the possibility of the secret agency’s intervention. Although Chiang had shown his determination to regulate the opposition, TangWai members could not ignore their suspicion that the KMT might deploy its secret agents if a new party was established. Thus, choosing the right time to announce the party, which could forestall KMT’s intervention, became a very crucial task for the TangWai group. According to the history of the opposition, “the KMT never arrested oppositionists before or during the electoral period.”143 This, of course, was also a concern of the KMT; they feared that they may destroy their democratic facade by arresting opposition members during the election. Besides, the TangWai also feared that the Civic Organization Bill, then still being drafted by the

143 Interviewee: Yu Hsi-k’un (游錫坤), recorded by Ch’en Jou-chin (陳柔缙), Private Politics (私房政治), Taipei, New News Cultural Press (新新聞), 1993, p.146.
KMT, might be so restrictive that after it was passed, forming an independent party would be harder.

The DPP, under these considerations, was born on September 28, 1986. The KMT's failure to repress the new DPP also proved the accuracy of above calculations. Right after the establishment of the DPP, on October 15, 1986, the KMT's Central Standing Committee passed two political reform acts, including the (1) Lifting of martial law and (2) Lifting of the prohibition of establishing new parties. These two acts directly led to Chiang's announcement to lift martial law in July 1987, and later to the passage of "Civil Organization Law" in January 1989. After the "Civil Organization Law" was signed into law, the DPP became totally legal, and Taiwan's democratization passed into a new era with competitive party politics.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

A key process in democratization is the establishment of a legally protected opposition. Indeed, some scholars see a tolerated opposition as the defining condition of democratization. Just as E. F. M. Durban had mentioned.¹⁴⁴

Democracy may be defined by the toleration of opposition. In so far as alternative governments are allowed to come into existence and into office, democracy exists. In so far as opposition is persecuted, rendered illegal, or stamped out of existence, democracy is not present, and either never has existed or is in the process of being destroyed.

Stephanie Lawson furthers this point and argues that:

Tolerated opposition of some kinds can be permitted in nondemocratic regimes, but a democratic regime requires that an opposition must be able to become the government, there is no constitutional opposition, and therefore no genuine democracy.¹⁴⁵

This definition, however, begs the question why the opposition is being tolerated, and how organized that opposition is. In the history of Taiwan's democratization, the KMT regime before the 1970s would only permit political opposition when it was individual-based, fragmented, and locally oriented. Once


these opposition powers attempted to form an organization which was collective, coalescing, and nationwide, “toleration” quickly evaporated. This was dramatically exemplified in the KMT’s suppression of the Free China group.

Since organized opposition was not tolerated by the KMT regime before the 1970s, the only way for the opposition to act collectively and effectively was to operate semi-covertly under the protection of KMT-sponsored publications such as Free China and The University. Beginning in the 1970s, domestic and international crises provided oppositionists with new opportunities to organize and articulate their interests. In the early 1970s, the decline of the KMT’s internal legitimacy, and the gradual derecognition of its external orthodoxy\(^{146}\) heightened the KMT’s legitimacy crisis and forced a change in the opposition’s “political opportunity structure.”\(^{147}\) These crises eventually led to Chiang Ching-kuo’s policies of congressional reform and KMT “Taiwanization.” Although the KMT used these two policies to maintain the integrity of its authority, the policies nevertheless also opened channels for opposition political participation. Opposition opportunities expanded still further during KMT’s leadership succession crises in the early 1970s, (when The University rose), and especially in the mid-1980s, when the DPP was established. This “opportunity structure” can be thought of as the external conditions or limitations on

\(^{146}\) KMT’s external orthodoxy: is to maintain the name of ROC and to be known as the sole legitimate government which stands for China.

the Taiwan opposition's alternatives or channels for organizing and eventually establishing the DPP. Ethnicity, Taiwan provincial origin and the “Taiwanese Ideology,” further opened up this opportunity to motivate, gather, and organize.

As Taiwan’s democratization has gathered increased global attention, a number of theories have been put forward to explain this transition. None, however, thoroughly probed the important relationship between KMT changes and opposition strategy in redefining the opportunity structure for democratization. In this next section, I will examine strengths and weaknesses of these various explanation.

Theories of Taiwan’s Democratization: A Critical Survey

How Did the Opposition Gain Its Opportunity to Organize?

One scholar, Hans Binnendijk, has cataloged four possible types of transition away from authoritarianism:

1. Uncontrolled revolutionary collapse, in which most institutions of the old society collapse along with the autocrat.
2. Revolutionary restructuring, which brings a restructuring of government within the institutions of the old society.
3. Revolution by coup d'état, where the military is the dominant political institution and military coups offer the only possibility for political change.
4. Managed transition, a process through which authoritarian leaders themselves see the need for a peaceful transition of government and plan for it. Their motives are varied and the process is not always fully under their control, but such transitions are generally successful.  

---

The developmental history of Taiwan's opposition clearly indicates that this transition belongs to the fourth type. The question, however, is why the KMT leadership began to "see the need" for a peaceful transition and chose to manage, rather than fight it. After all, the repression of the "Formosa Incident" demonstrates the KMT continued willingness to use force to hold on to power. Thus, Taiwan's transition clearly was not just an enlightened act of KMT leadership. Instead, it was motivated by the KMT's recognition of both its internal and external crises, the strengthening of the opposition, and the lessons which Chiang had learned about dealing with the opposition during the 1970s. If the KMT had never confronted its international derecognition crises, it is doubtful that Chiang Ching-kuo would have engaged in Taiwanization. Taiwan's worsening diplomatic relations with the U.S., exacerbated by the Ch'en Wen-cheng and Chiang Nan murders also indicated the ineffectiveness of repression as a KMT policy toward oppositionists. Moreover, the rapid growth of the opposition may have persuaded Chiang that it would be too costly to rely exclusively on repression to maintain temporary political stability, and such repression would backfire and increase long-term dissent amongst the population. Thus, the wavering in Chiang's attitudes during the 1970s and the early 1980s may be regarded as the result of these international frustrations and domestic lessons from relying on his old repressive apparatus. Absent internal sources on Chiang's thinking, it is impossible to say conclusively; but a review of the brutal history of Chiang Ching-kuo's repression of oppositionists from the Free China period to the TangWai period makes it hard to accept that Chiang Ching-kuo would have seen "the need for a
peaceful transition of government and plan[ed] for it” if these domestic and international “lessons” had not changed Chiang’s attitude toward liberalization.

Relatedly, other authors have argued that a democratic transition is most likely to occur when cleavages emerge within the ruling regime. And indeed, during the Free China era, the demands for democracy did emerge after a schism arose within the KMT regime. Neither this KMT internal struggle, nor these demands automatically guaranteed the beginning of a democratic transition. In other words, a schism may be one partial precondition to transition, but it is not a sufficient condition. In fact, after the destruction of the Free China group, Taiwan politics was dominated by the KMT’s intelligence agencies. The core leaders of Free China, such as Lei Chen and Hu Shih, did not have nearly enough power to challenge the KMT’s authority directly. All they could do was to depend for protection on their relationships with political patrons within the KMT’s regime. This also highlights the opposition’s need for an independent power base as an additional condition for democracy.

Indeed, the KMT’s history from 1949 to 1970 is rife with factionalism. The “CC faction” and the “Ch’en Cheng faction”\textsuperscript{149} were two main opponents of Chiang

\textsuperscript{149} Kuo Ch’u-yin (郭格印), The Struggle History of Factions in the KMT (國民黨派系鬥爭史), Taiwan: Kuei-Kuan Press (桂冠圖書), 1993, pp. 611-670. “CC faction” was powerful during the 1940s and early 1950s when it was in charge of the Investigation & Statistics Bureau of KMT Central Party (中統局). “Ch’en Cheng faction” was powerful during the 1950s and early 1960s when Ch’en Cheng was vice-president and prepared to succeed Chiang Kai-shek.
Ching-kuo’s succession. Even so, as powerful as these two factions were, their challenge to Chiang’s succession was still, finally, eliminated. By contrast, the oppositionists inside Free China and The University were merely liberals without any real political power base. As long as one faction perceives that it has the power to totally destroy its opponents, cleavages will escalate into power struggles. If one faction succeeds in decisively destroying its opposition, the opening for democratic transition will be immediately closed.\textsuperscript{150} One glaring example that a cleavage can create an opposition power in Taiwan is the emergence of the center-right Chinese New Party (CNP), founded in 1993. But, the CNP first emerged well into, not before, the democratic transition. Thus, the “Splits Within Regime” theory still is not a sufficient explanation for Taiwan’s democratic transition. Besides, even the CNP, which strongly identifies with Sun Yat-sen and the ideology of the KMT, differentiated from the KMT, in part, on the basis of mainlander origin. The CNP’s emergence is not so much a typical “Right-Left” cleavage, but is, rather, an ethnicity split.

While the stated rationale of its founders for splitting with the KMT was an interest in dissociating themselves from the corruption of the KMT, the CNP also provides a haven for former KMT mainlanders who may feel that their old party, heavily populated by Taiwanese, no longer represents their interests as vigorously as they would like.\textsuperscript{151}


\textsuperscript{151} Alan M. Wachman, \textit{Taiwan: National Identity and Democratization}, p. 255.
Ethnicity as a Weapon to Integrate the Opposition and Challenge KMT Authority

The opposition in Taiwan and its struggle with the KMT has not been simply a matter of reasonable people differing about political choice, nor was conflict between the KMT and the opposition merely a classic debate reflecting a “Right-Left” or “conservative- liberal” spectrum reflecting class origins and political temperament. Fundamentally, it was an ethnic-based conflict between the opposition’s (the Taiwanese) desire to be in power and the KMT’s (the Mainlanders) wish to stay in the power. “For most of the period leading to democratization, Mainlanders had power and Taiwanese did not. Gradually, the equation began to shift. Mainlanders still had most, but increasingly, the Taiwanese had some. With time, as democratization spread, that balance was reversed.”152 However, the conflict between Taiwanese and mainlanders may not simply have been a matter of who gains the power and who loses. Apparently, it is the “sympathetic consciousness” of provincial origin that makes this power-rebalance possible.

The most prominent schools of thought argues that Taiwan’s democratic transition was driven by socio-economic growth. The middle class, generated by economic growth, tends to lead Taiwan’s growing social reform movements such as the consumer movement, the environmental movement, the human rights movement,

152 Ibid.
and the women’s movement.\textsuperscript{153} Beginning in the 1970s, the economic growth in Taiwan dramatically influenced the changes of the opposition’s generations. It greatly enriched the cohort of oppositionists available to challenge the KMT’s authority. As socio-economic development deepened, ever-greater numbers of well-off and well-educated Taiwanese professionals emerged to join the opposition movement. With a quick look back at Tables 1 through 4, one can easily see that the average education level among the oppositionists rapidly increased after 1947. Beginning with \textit{The University} period, along with the increases in educational level, the number of middle and upper class Taiwanese among the opposition also expanded. The influence of socio-economic development not only provided the opposition with a financial base, but also allowed them to present the KMT with a more serious and professional challenge. However, these socio-economic background forces cannot by themselves sufficiently explain the sources of the Taiwan’s opposition. Upon closer examination (Table 5, 6, and 7)\textsuperscript{154}, provincial origin appears to be a more important variable than socio-economic status in shaping party identification (and, therefore, opposition) in Taiwan.

\textsuperscript{153} Hsiao Hsin-huang (蕭新煌), \textit{The Middle Classes in Taiwan: Formation and Implication.}, China Council’s Deliberative Conference on Taiwan Entering the 21 Century (中華學術會議臺灣邁向 21 世紀研討會), p. 9.

The data in Table 7 indicate a clear and strong association between provincial origins and party affiliation. Regardless of class, almost all mainlanders identified with the KMT, while nearly all opposition supporters were Taiwanese. This could also lead to the conclusion that the DPP is an indigenous Taiwanese party, while the mainlanders are KMT’s supporters. As shown, provincial origin apparently was an important basis for the formation of the party system in Taiwan, and also the prime motivation and basis for building opposition power and pushing Taiwan toward democracy.

Table 5

Party Identification by Family Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party Identification</th>
<th>Monthly Family Income*</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMT</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>85.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TangWai**</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>N=75</td>
<td>N=121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Low: lower than NT$20,000, Middle: NT$20,000-NT$50,000, High: more than NT$50,000. The exchange rate between NT$ and US$ was about 38:1 in 1986.
** Even though the DPP was formed in 1986, it was not legalized until January 1988. Nevertheless, TangWai is customarily taken as the predecessor of the DPP.
Table 6
Party Identification by Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party Identification</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KMT</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>100.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>(N=281)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TangWai</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>100.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>(N=36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>N=154</td>
<td>N=127</td>
<td>N=36</td>
<td>(N=317)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Low: uneducated, primary school, or junior high school, Middle: senior high school, or professional school, High: college or above.

Table 7
Party Identification by Provincial Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party Identification</th>
<th>Provincial Origin</th>
<th>Total%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taiwanese*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mainlanders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMT</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TangWai</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total%</td>
<td>N=244</td>
<td>N=96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Aboriginal and Hakka are coded into the Taiwanese category because N is not large enough to allow a meaningful analysis.

Source: All the three tables are from computations based on the 1986 Taiwan National Election Survey conducted by National Chengchih University.
With a quick look at Table 5, we can see that the party identification percentages of three “income” categories contradicts the “economic growth / democratization” theory in Taiwan. Ironically, among middle income families, over 85%, supported the KMT. Thus, even the middle class, commonly thought of as the engine of democratization, supported the KMT, and not the opposition movement. Thus, socio-economic development may help shape the framework for how the oppositionists emerged. But, to describe precisely how the opposition obtained and consolidated popular support, it is necessary to look further, to provincial differences.

The Strategy of the Opposition

In addition to socio-economic growth, power struggles and provincial differences are central for understanding Taiwan’s democratization. In this thesis, I have tried to argue that the rise of Taiwan’s opposition can be better understood by looking at its strategic responses to a changing opportunity structure. There were, of course, factional disagreements concerning the TangWai’s methods of challenging the KMT. Still, for simplicity’s sake, we may summarize the Taiwan opposition’s strategies as follows:

1. Using KMT’s Constitutional Dilemmas and 228 Incident to Generate Conflict

The idea of establishing a new party originated from Taiwan’s constitutional dilemmas and the residue of distrust from the 228 Incident. A democratic regime, as noted above by Stephanie Lawson, “requires opposition that is able to become the
government. In other words, it must have the constitutional status of a legitimate alternative government which the people have the power to choose to actually govern.\textsuperscript{155} The KMT's power monopoly of the central government and national congresses maintained KMT's orthodoxy on one hand, but forced the local Taiwanese elites to counter KMT's authority, and seek more political power on the other. At the same time, martial law restricted the freedom of association and speech. During this period, the KMT's attitude was very much that of a colonial ruler. Although this power monopoly in the political system was regarded by the KMT as simply maintaining its orthodoxy, the local Taiwanese elites did not accept that concept of orthodoxy, and did not view the KMT as a legitimate government in Taiwan. These differing perceptions caused bitter disagreements between KMT authorities and the Taiwanese elites, who had no power. Being, on the one hand, under the watch and suspicion of secret agents, and, on the other, lacking the ability to gather enough opposition power to challenge the KMT after the 228 Incident, the local Taiwanese elites had little choice but to seek government protection and recognition in order to restore their potential power. Their protection, before the 1970s, came in the KMT-sponsored magazines \textit{Free China} and \textit{The University}.

2. Using Free China and The University as Instruments to Test KMT’s Toleration

Although the Free China magazine was composed of crucial KMT figures in its early period, local Taiwanese elites entered and dominated the magazine when the publication attempted to establish a new party. The reputation of Hu Shih, the high-ranking positions of Free China members in the KMT, and even the personal relationship between Lei Chen and Chiang Kai-shek all offered incentives for the local Taiwanese elites to join the Free China group. However, when they began to act as a collective opposition, especially when they tried to establish a new party, the Free China core members’ affiliations with the KMT leadership could no longer guarantee safety. Besides, this collective action did not even obtain support from some core members of Free China, especially the mainlanders. Most importantly, Free China underestimated the power of Chiang Ching-kuo’s secret police. The devastation of the Free China taught the opposition two lessons: First, the risk of dependency and the uncertainty of finding protection within the regime; and second, the total disruption of opposition’s organizational continuity after the KMT’s purge of Free China. Under these two considerations, oppositionists had to contemplate some difficult challenges. The first, was how to integrate the opposition effectively and collectively, given the cleavage between Taiwanese and mainlander oppositionists during the late period of Free China on the issue of establishing a new party. The second was to find an effective source of protection which could politically guarantee their safety, or at least maintain their organizational continuity in challenging the authorities after incidents
such as the KMT's political abuses in Free China Incident.

3. Finding a Strong Protective Shield

Stung repeatedly by the uncertainty of their dependent relationship with the KMT authorities, the opposition finally changed direction and sought support and protection from an independent mass power base. In order to gain support from the people, the opposition had to participate in the KMT-run elections. At the same time, new electoral opportunities opened for the opposition power when a process of natural attrition had, by 1966, cut down the size of the National Assembly to 1488 delegates, and the Legislative Yuan to about half of its original size. The KMT amended the "Temporary Provisions" so that elections could be called to fill the National Assembly and Legislative Yuan vacancies. The first "supplementary election", held in 1969, was also the first opportunity the local Taiwanese had ever had to enter the national congresses. Further, "supplementary elections" were held in 1973, 1976, 1980, 1983, and 1986. The more opposition members were elected as public representatives, the greater the protection the opposition enjoyed. Although the rising prosperity of the TangWai oppositionists caused the KMT to lash out and make one last major effort to suppress the opposition, (in the Formosa Incident,) the KMT soon discovered it could not totally eliminate the opposition. Conversely, the political suppression exercised by the KMT actually accelerated the rise of opposition and generated new generations of opposition elites, such as the Formosa attorney group and the relatives of Formosa victims.
4. Integrating the Opposition

In order to integrate, local elites had to design a banner under which they could gather the opposition forces. Many analyses of party systems stress social cleavages and their effects on the formation of these systems. Under the KMT rule, a serious provincial origin cleavage emerged between Taiwanese and mainlanders.\footnote{Jaushieh Joseph Wu, “The Emerging Political Party System in the Republic of China,” Issues and Studies, Taipei: Chengchih University Press, November 1991, p. 136.}\footnote{Max Weber, The Methodology of the Social Sciences, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1949, pp. 182-185.} Max Weber has argued that a dramatic event predisposing a country toward democracy sets in motion a process which increases the likelihood that at the next critical point in the country’s history democracy will win out again.\footnote{Jaushieh Joseph Wu, “The Emerging Political Party System in the Republic of China,” Issues and Studies, Taipei: Chengchih University Press, November 1991, p. 136.}\footnote{Max Weber, The Methodology of the Social Sciences, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1949, pp. 182-185.} In Taiwan’s case, the bloody 228 Incident left a deep scar of mutual distrust between the Taiwanese and mainlanders. On one hand, many Taiwanese regarded the KMT government as a ruthless foreign regime, and the political power of the government as entirely in the hands of KMT mainlanders. On the other hand, mainlanders in Taiwan may feel that their minority status as well as their politically privileged positions mean that they could only expect protection by a KMT regime, a fact which would, doubtless, strengthen their identification with the KMT. Under this situation, the 228 Incident and KMT’s provincial discrimination led to the growing integration of opposition power based on the provincial origin. In addition to integrating themselves,
the oppositionists also recruited new generations from the KMT regime such as The University editorial members Chang Chun-hung and Hsu Hsin-liang, who's political views were fostered by the KMT. This led to the association of the local elites with certain intellectuals after the decline of The University magazine.

5. Stressing the Decline in the KMT’s “External Orthodoxy” and Its Legitimacy Crisis

The “supplementary elections” ensured that the channels of political participation would continue to open gradually, and that the KMT’s legitimacy would be recovered in the near future. However, Taiwan still retained its isolated status in the international environment during the 1970s. Thus, a more severe legitimacy problem, Taiwan’s identity, arose based on what I have called the “Taiwanese Ideology.” The very existence of a Taiwanese identity directly challenged the KMT’s Constitution which declares that the ROC’s jurisdiction includes, and indeed is defined by the inclusion of, mainland China. This striking proposal of a Taiwanese identity not only centralized support for the opposition from Taiwanese but also caused the KMT’s inability to remedy its international legitimacy dilemma by using institutional instruments like elections. Therefore, through the elections after the Formosa Incident, the opposition began to challenge the KMT’s external orthodoxy. As a result of the elections, the opposition, under the protection of their newly acquired public posts and the support obtained in the elections, began to be able to play the role of an opposition party, and had the power and capability to compete with
the KMT in the political system.

6. Taking Advantage of Opportunities Within the KMT

Before the 1970s, overt opposition movements were totally repressed and dominated by the intelligence organizations and Chiang Ching-Kuo’s leadership. During this period, the KMT gave no indication that it would ever tolerate the establishment of a formal opposition party. The case of Free China and P’eng Ming-min, moreover, further deepened the distrust between the KMT and its opponents. The first suggestion of toleration for organized opposition emerged only in the early 1970s, when Chiang Ching-kuo was forced to confront Taiwan’s international recognition crisis during the process of his succession struggle.

In 1971, the KMT was effectively expelled from the international community when the Republic of China was forced to withdraw from the United Nations after the U.N. voted to seat the government of the Peoples’ Republic of China. The situation worsened dramatically in 1972, when president Nixon visited mainland China and signed the Shanghai Communique, under which the U.S. continued to officially recognize the R.O.C., but which clearly signaled eventual U.S. recognition of Beijing. Furthermore, beginning in September 1972, when Japan established a formal official relationship with China, countries including Japan and the main nations in West Europe began transferring their diplomatic recognition from the ROC to the PRC. Under these circumstances, Beijing was suddenly able to isolate Taiwan
diplomatically,\footnote{Masatake Wakabayashi (若林正丈), \textit{Democratization in a Divided Country} (臺灣：分裂國家與民主化), pp. 174-175.} in much the same way Taiwan had isolated Beijing for 23 years.

These international crises signaled the destruction of KMT’s external orthodoxy which had defined Taiwan by its status as a mere province of China. Although the United States did not establish a formal relationship with China until December 1978, the United States’ crucial support for the KMT’s external orthodoxy had clearly decreased tremendously. In order to resolve the dilemma of external orthodoxy, caused by the international crises, and to stabilize his power bases, Chiang Ching-kuo implemented two policies: congressional reform and the “Taiwanization” of the KMT. The “supplementary elections” were products of Chiang’s congressional reform, and some new generations of ethnic Taiwanese KMT elites, such as president Teng-hui, presidential candidate Lin Yang-kang, and vice president-elect Lien Chan, were co-opted by the personnel policy of Taiwanization.

The congressional reform partially opened channels of political participation for Taiwan’s oppositionists, and allowed them to enter the national congresses. But, due to the KMT’s “non-systematical individual co-optation”,\footnote{Ibid., p. 186; “non-systematical individual co-optation” (非制度性個別攬絡): means that KMT did not co-opt Taiwanese through its formal personnel channels, but by the personal approval of Chiang Ching-kuo. Thus, Chiang only promoted his Taiwanese intimates and ignored the other Taiwanese oppositionists.} the Taiwanization policy still could not co-opt all the Taiwanese, especially the post-war, Mandarin speaking, and educated new generations of Taiwanese.
These new generations of educated, Mandarin speaking Taiwanese finally joined with local Taiwanese leadership groups, and constituted the foundation for the TangWai’s power.

In addition to the KMT’s international crises in the 1970s, the KMT’s succession crisis in the early 1980s also encouraged the rise of the opposition. The KMT’s power succession in the late Chiang period caused Chiang to propose the “Political Renovation” policy. This renovation, accompanied by his dismissal of the KMT hard-liners, revealed how determined to democratize Chiang had become by 1986. Moreover, when reinforced by the rest of the KMT’s desire for stability going into the post-Chiang Ching-kuo succession period, the policy greatly decreased the likelihood that the KMT would repress the TangWai for establishing itself as an official opposition party.

Thus, the emergence of Taiwan’s first opposition party -- the DPP, was achieved through the opposition power’s strategic maneuverings and KMT’s encouragement. The KMT’s successful suppression of the opposition during the last four decades might seem to suggest signs of current outward stability, but the KMT government’s efforts to prevent the development of a political opposition have also made the regime presumptively unstable. As Huntington has argued, “The longer the organizational vacuum is maintained, the more explosive it becomes.”

Once an

---

opposition movement is suppressed, it will try to plant its roots in large, powerful, and at times sympathetic social dynamics such as, in this paper, provincial origin and Taiwanese ideology. Long periods of opposition suppression will therefore “generate forces which, when the authoritarian rule comes to an end, burst forth with explosive energy.”\textsuperscript{161} In Taiwan, this kind of “explosive energy”, also the dynamic for democratization, was found to be the “sympathetic consciousness” of provincial origin, and further generated the demand for political participation, an legalized opposition party, and finally the independence of Taiwan.

\textsuperscript{161} Ibid., p. 407.
Appendix A

The System of KMT’s Intelligence Organizations
The System of KMT's Intelligence Organizations:

The Investigation & Statistics Bureau of Military Committee. (軍事委員會調查統計局：軍統局) 1938

The Investigation & Statistics Bureau of KMT's Central Party. (中央黨部調查統計局：中統局)

The Classified Bureau of National Defense (國防部保密局) 1945

Investigation Bureau of Party Organization (黨部調查局)

Investigation Bureau of National Affairs (內政部調查局)

Department of Society (社會部)

(after the KMT withdrew to Taiwan)

The Committee of Political Action (政治行動委員會) 1949

The Data Group of Confidential Affairs Office in the Presidential Office (總統府機要室資料組) 1950

The National Security Bureau (國家安全局：蔣經國, 1955)

The Security Offices (安全室) of Organizations, Companies, Associations, and Schools

Source: Shih Ming(史明), The Four Hundred Years History of Taiwanese (臺灣人四百年史), Formosa Culture, p. 877.
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